PB-230 565

WATER RESOURCES ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES. REVIEWS OF NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES DURING THE PAST FIFTY YEARS

Select Committee on National Water Resources, U. S. Senate

October 1959

DISTRIBUTED BY:

NTIS

National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield Va. 22151

PB 230 565

F M Middleton

RESTRICTED OFFICE COPY

86th Congress
1st Session

COMMITTEE PRINT NO. 2

WATER RESOURCES ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

REVIEWS OF NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES DURING THE PAST FIFTY YEARS

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

PURSUANT TO

S. Res. 48

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

RECEIVED
LIBRARY
AUG 2 1968
FWPCA, OHIO BASIN REGION
4676 COLUMBIA PKWY, CINTI. O.

OCTOBER 1959

Reproduced by
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U S Department of Commerce
Springfield VA 22151

Printed for the use of the Select Committee on National Water Resources

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
47676 WASHINGTON : 1959

48

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES

(Pursuant to S. Res. 48, 86th Cong.)

ROBERT S. KERR, Oklahoma, *Chairman*
THOMAS H. KUCHEL, California, *Vice Chairman*

DENNIS CHAVEZ, New Mexico
ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana
WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Washington
CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico
HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
CLAIR ENGLE, California
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan
GALE W. McGEE, Wyoming
FRANK E. MOSS, Utah
JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana, ex officio

MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota
ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, Kansas
FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota
THOS. E. MARTIN, Iowa
HUGH SCOTT, Pennsylvania

PAUL McBRIDE, *Chief Clerk*
THEODORE M. SCHAD, *Staff Director*

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

OCTOBER 6, 1959.

To the Members of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources:

During the past 50 years over 20 commissions or committees have looked into national water policies and problems. Some were composed of personnel of the executive branch of Government only, others were members of the legislative branch, and still others included members from both branches of the Government and from the public at large. Some were established by Presidential directive while others came into being as a result of congressional action. All were composed of men having a sincere interest in various phases of the water problem, either Federal, State, or local. The influence of each of the studies and of the recommendations which may have followed, have been of profound significance in the field of water resources. Although many of the recommendations may not nave led to specific legislation their sum total has helped to guide past action and will serve a very useful purpose for the future.

In order that the committee might have the benefit of the results of these prior studies as a part of the background for its deliberations, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress was requested to review them and summarize their contents briefly for the committee's use. The following review, discussing the circumstances under which the previous commissions and committees were established, their membership, aims, objectives, types of studies undertaken, and their recommendations, was prepared by Barbara Jibrin of the Legislative Reference Service in response to the committee's request.

It will be noted that with one or two exceptions previous study groups did not pay specific attention to questions placed before our committee by the Senate, such as "How much water development is needed?" "When is it needed?" "Where is it needed?" "What should be the pattern of water development?" "What levels of cost and expenditures are justifiable for future water development?" "What amounts of water will be required in relation to various levels of population and economic activity?" "What are the economic limits of water development?" And "How much expenditure of public and private funds can be economically justified for water programs?"

Nevertheless I believe that to the greatest practicable extent the studies and findings of the previous commissions and committees should be kept in mind and fully used by the select committee during present studies. The review contained herein will be helpful to the committee in this respect and will be of interest to all Members of the Senate and to others concerned with water problems and policies. Accordingly, I am having it printed as one of a series of committee prints dealing with various aspects of water resource activities.

ROB'T. S. KERR,
Chairman, Select Committee
on National Water Resources.

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Inland Waterways Commission, March 14, 1907	3
National Conservation Commission, June 8, 1908	5
National Waterways Commission, March 3, 1909	8
Waterways Commission, March 1, 1917	10
Joint Committee on Reorganization of the Executive Departments, December 17, 1920	11
"308" Reports, March 3, 1925	13
Executive orders grouping, coordinating, and consolidating certain executive and administrative agencies of the Government, June 30, 1932	14
Reports of the important committees and boards preparing emergency programs in the field of national water resources during the economic depression of the 1930's	16
A. President's Committee on Water Flow, February 2, 1934	16
B. Mississippi Valley Committee of the Public Works Administration	16
C. National Resources Board, June 30, 1934	17
D. National Resources Committee, June 1935	18
Select Committee To Investigate the Executive Agencies of the Government, February 24, 1936	22
President's Committee on Administrative Management, 1937	24
The Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government (First Hoover Commission), July 7, 1947	26
President's Water Resources Policy Commission (Cooke Commission), January 3, 1950	29
The President's Materials Policy Commission (Paley Commission), January 22, 1951	32
Subcommittee To Study Civil Works, House of Representatives, 82d Congress, 2d session (Jones subcommittee), August 20, 1951	34
Missouri Basin Survey Commission, January 3, 1952	36
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (Kestnbaum Commission), July 10, 1953	38
Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—Report on Water Resources and Power (Second Hoover Commission), July 10, 1953	40
Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, May 26, 1954	43

Preceding page blank

REVIEWS OF NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES DURING THE PAST FIFTY YEARS

INTRODUCTION

The tradition of the appointment of commissions to examine and make recommendations on the development of the Nation's water resources actually extends back to the beginnings of the the Nation, when, under the influence of George Washington, commissioners were appointed to consider plans for improved navigation on the Potomac River. A few years later, Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin began the preparation of his report on roads and canals (1808), which may be said to have ushered in the waterway policy of the United States.

This farsighted decision to take a comprehensive look at our natural resources has been repeated again and again throughout the history of the United States. The surveys and recommendations of these commissions and committees parallel the development of our natural resources and reflect the impact of this development upon the economy of the Nation. The influence of the reports on water resource policy and planning during the last 50 years has been especially significant.

This review goes back to the beginning of the 20th century to the commissions appointed by one of the leaders of the modern school of conservationists, Theodore Roosevelt, and covers the recommendations of the important studies from that time down to the present. It was during the Roosevelt period that the important concept of multiple use and comprehensive planning for water resources development was actively promoted. All three of the commissions appointed during his term of office stated emphatically that all the uses of a stream should be considered and included in any plans for its development.

This recommendation was accepted by Congress almost as soon as it was made, but it has taken many years to put across as a standard procedure for planning for Federal water resources projects, and too many projects have been planned and constructed wastefully, for a single purpose. Advocacy of the principle of multiple purpose planning has been a feature of almost all the subsequent reports by the other fact-finding bodies appointed by Congress and the Presidents, and this principle has been restated in much of the legislation governing water resource development.

The Congress, in 1927, authorized a series of comprehensive river basin plans to be prepared by the Corps of Army Engineers, which were of such broad scope that they have been included for discussion in this review. Even broader studies of the Arkansas-White-Red Basins, and the New England-New York area were authorized by the Congress in 1950, and were carried out under the direction of the Army Engineers with participation by other Federal agencies and the States.

Other recommendations of the commissions appointed by Roosevelt, such as those of the National Conservation Commission (1908–9) in the fields of land, mineral, and forestry resources, have been acted upon. The programs outlined for the conservation of these natural resources, and such recommendations as the establishment of a Bureau of Mines, have all been incorporated into legislation.

Throughout the 50-year period covered by this review, Congress has created special committees to investigate the executive branch of the Government and make recommendations on reorganization that would lead to economy, efficiency, elimination of duplication and waste, and general improvement of the working of the Federal Government. Many of these committees recommended placing all of the activities dealing with water resources development under one department, either in the Department of the Interior or in a new agency such as a Department of Public Works. An impartial Board of Review to review and report to the President on all engineering projects has been recommended frequently. Still another recommendation was to establish separate river basin commissions for planning the development of each basin. These recommendations have been the subject of many hearings and re-

ports by the Congress, and bills have been introduced to implement them, but have not been generally enacted into law. However, last year (1958) the Congress established two such commissions for planning water resources development in Texas and in the southeastern river basins.

Two relatively recent Federal programs—the water pollution abatement and the saline water research programs—were first recommended in a number of the reports of the various commissions or committees.

Although it cannot be said that all the legislation enacted in the areas covered by the commissions and committees was the direct result of their recommendations, it is certainly true that the influence of their studies affected the entire development and evolution of Federal water resources legislation. The concept of taking stock of our resources and attempting to predict future needs is one which has proven to have been well grounded, and will undoubtedly continue to be an important factor in the development of our water resources.

INLAND WATERWAYS COMMISSION

CIRCUMSTANCES

The Inland Waterways Commission was established by President Theodore Roosevelt March 14, 1907. In his letter to the members of the Commission, the President said:

> Numerous commercial organizations of the Mississippi Valley have presented petitions asking that I appoint a commission to prepare and report a comprehensive plan for the improvement and control of the river systems of the United States. I have decided to comply with these requests by appointing an Inland Waterways Commission * * *
>
> * * * Works designed to control our waterways have thus far usually been undertaken for a single purpose, such as the improvement of navigation, the development of power, the irrigation of arid lands, the protection of lowlands from floods, or to supply water for domestic and manufacturing purposes. While the rights of the people to these and similar uses of water must be respected, the time has come for merging local projects and uses of the inland waters in a comprehensive plan designed for the benefit of the entire country. Such a plan should consider and include all the uses to which streams may be put, and should bring together and coordinate the points of view of all users of water. The task involved in the full and orderly development and control of the river systems of the United States is a great one, yet it is certainly not too great for us to approach. The results which it seems to promise are even greater.[1]

ORGANIZATION

The President asked the following men to serve on the Commission:

Hon. Theo E. Burton, Ohio, Chairman
Senator Francis G. Newlands, Nevada
Senator William Warner, Missouri
Hon. John H. Bankhead, Alabama
Gen. Alexander Mackenzie, former Chief of Engineers
Mr. W J McGee, expert, Department of Agriculture
Mr. F. H. Newell, Chief Hydrographer, U.S. Geological Survey
Mr. Gifford Pinchot, Chief, Forest Service
Hon. Herbert Knox Smith, Commissioner of Corporations, Department of Commerce and Labor

The Commission made inspection trips on the Mississippi from St. Louis to the Passes, on the Great Lakes from Cleveland to Duluth, on the Mississippi from St. Paul to Memphis, and on the Missouri from Kansas City to St. Louis. While provision was not made for formal hearings, experts on matters entrusted to the Commission were present by invitation at 24 sessions; of these experts there were 24 (of whom several attended 2 or more sessions), a majority being officers or civilian employees of the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army.

In addition to the formal sessions, two or three Commissioners jointly inspected the upper Missouri, the Columbia and Snake, the Sacramento and San Joaquin, and their leading tributaries.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

On February 3, 1908, the preliminary report of the Inland Waterways Commission was issued (701 pages). It was published as Senate Document 325, 60th Congress, 1st session. In addition to its findings and recommendations, separate reports were prepared on the following subjects: (1) navigable streams of the United States; (2) commerce on interior rivers; (3) statistics of commerce on the Great Lakes; (4) Government aid to inland navigation; (5) rivers where the Federal Government has improved navigation by means of locks and dams; (6) canals in the United States; (7) State and private canals; (8) relation of water transportation to railroad rates; (9) railroad control of river traffic and private canals; (10) relations between waterways and railway traffic in Europe (J. C. Welliver); (11) effects of the purity of industrial water supplies on their use (R. B. Dole); (12) applications of water power (W. E. Herring); (13) relation of water conservation to flood prevention and navigation in Ohio River (M. O. Leighton); (14) fuels and structural materials in relation to inland water transportation (Joseph A. Holmes); (15) general relations of forests and streams (Raphael Zon); (16) special relations of forests to rivers in the United States (W. W. Ashe). Also included were (17) the Gallatin report; (18) report of the Windom select committee; and (19) Statutes relating to water power (Alexander MacKenzie, brigadier general, U.S. Army, Chief of Engineers).

[1] S. Doc. 325, 60th Cong., 1st sess., p. 15.

The commission made the following recommendations:

A. We recommend that hereafter plans for the improvement of navigation in inland waterways, or for any use of these waterways in connection with interstate commerce, shall take account of the purification of the waters, the development of power, the control of floods, the reclamation of lands by irrigation and drainage, and all other uses of the waters or benefits to be derived from their control.

B. We recommend that hereafter both local and general benefits to the people shall be fully considered in any such plans for the improvement of navigation in inland waterways, or for any use of these waterways in connection with interstate commerce; and that wherever practicable Federal agencies shall cooperate with States, municipalities, communities, corporations, and individuals with a view to an equitable distribution of costs and benefits.

C. We recommend that hereafter any plans for the navigation or other use of inland waterways in connection with interstate commerce shall take full account of transfer facilities and sites, and of the location of tracks, grades, bridges, dams, depots, and other works on navigable and source streams with a view to equitable cooperation between waterway and railway facilities for the promotion of commerce and the benefit of the people.

D. We recommend that any plans for improving the inland waterways shall take account of the present and prospective relation of rail lines to such waterways, and shall ascertain so far as may be whether such waterways when improved will be effectively used in the face of railway competition; and that the relations between railways and waterways be further examined with the purpose of devising means of rendering the two systems complementary and harmonious and making such fair division of traffic that rates and management may be coordinated economically and with benefit to the country.

E. We recommend the adoption of means for ascertaining regularly all facts related to traffic on the inland waterways, and for publishing the same in a form suitable for general use.

F. We recommend the adoption of means for ascertaining and rendering available, at such rate as to meet public necessities, all requisite data related to the physical character and general utility of the navigable and source streams of the country.

G. We recommend that hereafter any plans for the use of inland waterways in connection with interstate commerce shall regard the streams of the country as an asset of the people, shall take full account of the conservation of all resources connected with running waters, and shall look to the protection of these resources from monopoly and to their administration in the interests of the people.

H. We recommend that the Congress be asked to make suitable provision for improving the inland waterways of the United States at a rate commensurate with the needs of the people as determined by competent authority; and we suggest that such provision meet these requisites, viz: expert framing of a definite policy; certainty of continuity and coordination of plan and work; expert initiative in the choice of projects and the succession of works; freedom in selection of projects in accordance with terms of cooperation; and the widest opportunity for applying modern business methods.

I. We recommend that the Congress be asked to authorize the coordination and proper development of existing public services connected with waterways; and we suggest that such enactment might provide that the President of the United States be authorized, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint and organize a National Waterways Commission to bring into coordination the Corps of Engineers of the Army, the Bureau of Soils, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Corporations, the Reclamation Service, and other branches of the public service insofar as their work relates to inland waterways, and that he be authorized to make such details and require such duties from these branches of the public service in connection with navigable and source streams as are not inconsistent with law; the said Commission to continue the investigation of all questions relating to the development and improvement and utilization of the inland waterways of the country and the conservation of its natural resources related thereto, and to consider and coordinate therewith all matters of irrigation, swamp and overflow land reclamation, clarification and purification of streams, prevention of soil waste, utilization of water power, preservation and extension of forests, regulation of flow and control of floods, transfer facilities and sites and the regulation and control thereof, and the relations between waterways and railways; that the Commission be empowered to frame and recommend plans for developing the waterways and utilizing the waters, and as authorized by Congress to carry out the same, through established agencies when such are available, in cooperation with States, municipalities, communities, corporations, and individuals, in such manner as to secure an equitable distribution of costs and benefits.[3]

[3] Ibid., pp. 25–27.

NATIONAL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

CIRCUMSTANCES

The letter of President Theodore Roosevelt of June 8, 1908, to those designated to serve on the National Conservation Commission, indicated that the Commission "was to inquire into and advise me as to the condition of our natural resources, and to cooperate with other bodies created for a similar purpose by the States." The President's letter began as follows:

> The recent conference of Governors in the White House confirmed and strengthened in the minds of our people the conviction that our natural resources are being consumed, wasted, and destroyed at a rate which threatens them with exhaustion. It was demonstrated that the inevitable result of our present course toward these resources, if we should persist in following it, would ultimately be the impoverishment of our people. The Governors present adopted unanimously a declaration reciting the necessity for a more careful conservation of the foundations of our national prosperity, and recommending a more effective cooperation to this end among the States and between the States and the Nation.[1]

Under authority of Executive Order No. 809, June 8, 1908, the Conservation Commission undertook the making of an inventory of the natural resources of the United States, in cooperation with the executive departments of the Government, State officers, and with national organizations.

ORGANIZATION

The President, in the above-mentioned letter, declared that the Commission would be organized in four sections to consider four great classes of natural resources—water, forest, land, and mineral resources.

The personnel of the National Conservation Commission was as follows:

WATERS

Theodore E. Burton, Ohio, Chairman
Francis G. Newlands, Nevada
Jonathan P. Dolliver, Iowa
William Warner, Missouri
John H. Bankhead, Alabama
W J McGee, Bureau of Soils, secretary
F. H. Newell, Reclamation Service
Gifford Pinchot, Forest Service
Herbert Knox Smith, Bureau of Corporations
Joseph E. Ransdell, Louisiana
G. F. Swain, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
W. L. Marshall, brigadier general, U.S. Army, Chief of Engineers

FORESTS

Reed Smoot, Utah, Chairman
Albert J. Beveridge, Indiana
Charles F. Scott, Kansas
Champ Clark, Missouri
J. B. White, Missouri
Henry S. Graves, Yale Forest School
Wm. Irvine, Wisconsin
Newton C. Blanchard, Louisiana
Charles L. Pack, New Jersey
Irving Fisher, Connecticut
Gustav H. Schwab, New York
Overton W. Price, Forest Service, secretary

LANDS

Knute Nelson, Minnesota, Chairman
Francis E. Warren, Wyoming
Swagar Sherley, Kentucky
Herbert Parsons, New York
N. D. Broward, Florida
James J. Hill, Minnesota
George C. Pardee, California
Charles Macdonald, New York
Murdo Mackenzie, Colorado
T. C. Chamberlin, University of Chicago
Frank C. Goudy, Colorado
George W. Woodruff, Interior Department, secretary.

MINERALS

John Dalzell, Pennsylvania, Chairman
Joseph M. Dixon, Montana
Frank P. Flint, California
Lee S. Overman, North Carolina
Philo Hall, South Dakota
James L. Slayden, Texas
Andrew Carnegie, New York
Charles R. Van Hise, Wisconsin
John Mitchell, Illinois
John Hayes Hammond, Massachusetts
I. C. White, West Virginia
J. A. Holmes, Geological Survey, secretary

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Gifford Pinchot, Chairman
Theodore E. Burton
Reed Smoot
Knute Nelson
John Dalzell
W J McGee

[1] S. Doc. 676, 60th Cong., 2d sess., p. 115.

Overton W. Price
G. W. Woodruff
Joseph A. Holmes
Secretary of the Commission, Thomas R. Shiff (elected by the executive committee)

The general supervision of the compilation of material was placed in the hands of Mr. Henry Gannett, whom the President assigned to assist the Commission in its work.

The work of the Commission was aided by the rapid appointment of State conservation commissions, which numbered 35 at the time the report was submitted. Also, there were 41 national organizations assisting the Commission.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE REPORT

A three-volume report was completed on January 22, 1909. It was printed as Senate Document 676, 60th Congress, 2d session.

Throughout the report, a vigorous policy of conservation was advocated. In a special message transmitting the report, President Roosevelt said:

> The policy of conservation is perhaps the most typical of the general policies which this Government has made peculiarly its own during the opening years of the present century. The function of our Government is to insure to all its citizens, now and hereafter, their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If we of this generation destroy the resources from which our children would otherwise derive their livelihood, we reduce the capacity of our land to support a population, and so either degrade the standard of living or deprive the coming generations of their right to life on this continent. If we allow great industrial organizations to exercise unregulated control of the means of production and the necessaries of life, we deprive the Americans of today and of the future of industrial liberty, a right no less precious and vital than political freedom. Industrial liberty was a fruit of political liberty, and in turn has become one of its chief supports, and exactly as we stand for political democracy so we must stand for industrial democracy.[3]

The report indicated the various means of conserving resources in the four fields of water, forests, land, and minerals. In the field of water resources, the Commission commented and recommended as follows:

> It is now recognized * * * that navigation is interdependent with other uses of the streams; that each stream is essentially a unit from its source to the sea; and that the benefits of a comprehensive system of waterway improvement will extend to all the people in the several sections and States of the country.
>
> It is also recognized * * * that in the use of the natural resources the independent States are interdependent, and bound together by ties of mutual benefits, responsibilities, and duties.
>
> It has recently been declared by a majority of our leading statesmen that it is an imperative duty to enter upon a systematic improvement, on a large and comprehensive plan, just to all portions of the country, of the waterways and harbors and Great Lakes, whose natural adaptability to the increasing traffic of the land is one of the greatest gifts of a benign Providence; while the minority endorsed the movement for control of the waterways still more specifically and in equally emphatic terms.[3]
>
> * * * * *
>
> The first requisite for waterway improvement is the control of the waters in such manner as to reduce floods and regulate the regimen of the navigable rivers. The second requisite is development of terminals and connections in such manner as to regulate commerce.
>
> In considering the uses and benefits to be derived from the waters, the paramount use should be water supply; next should follow navigation in humid regions and irrigation in arid regions. The development of power on the navigable and source streams should be coordinated with the primary and secondary uses of the waters. Other things being equal, the development of power should be encouraged, not only to reduce the drain on other resources, but because properly designed reservoirs and powerplants retard the runoff and so aid in the control of the streams for navigation and other uses.
>
> Broad plans should be adopted providing for a system of waterway improvement extending to all uses of the waters and benefits to be derived from their control, including the clarification of the water and abatement of floods for the benefit of navigation; the extension of irrigation; the development and application of power; the prevention of soil wash; the purification of streams for water supply; and the drainage and utilization of the waters of swamp and overflow lands.
>
> To promote and perfect these plans, scientific investigations, surveys, and measurements should be continued and extended, especially the more accurate determination of rainfall and evaporation, the investigation and measurement of ground water, the gaging of streams and determination of sediment, and topographic surveys of catchment areas and sites available for control of the waters for navigation and related purposes.[4]

The report on minerals showed that the consumption of nearly all mineral products was increasing more rapidly than the population. The mineral waste was shown to be about one-sixth of the product and the loss of structural materials through fire was about $1 million a day. The loss of life in the mines was appalling and the larger part of the losses could be avoided. The report recommended further investigation in order to improve mining methods and to develop and apply substitutes if we were to conserve the supply of minerals.

[3] Ibid., p. 3.

[4] Ibid., p. 24.
[4] Ibid., p. 24.

President Roosevelt said that it was of the utmost importance that a Bureau of Mines be established in accordance with a bill then pending "to reduce the loss of life in the mines and the waste of mineral resources and to investigate the methods and substitutes for prolonging the duration of our mineral supplies."[5]

The report on forests urged the conservation of all forests, and stressed the need for conservation of mountain forests, such as the Appalachian system, for regulation of streams used for navigation and other purposes. They said:

> The conservation of these forests is impracticable through private enterprise alone, or by any State alone, or by the Federal Government alone. Effective and immediate cooperation between these three agencies is essential. Federal ownership of limited protective areas upon important watersheds, effective State fire patrol, and the cooperation of private forest owners are all required.[6]

The Commission called for good fire laws, well enforced. They advocated a vigorous national campaign in education on how to practice forestry. They said that by reasonable thrift, we could produce a constant timber supply beyond our present need, and with it conserve the usefulness of our streams for irrigation, water supply, navigation, and power.

[5] Ibid., p. 8.
[6] Ibid., pp. 20–21.

In its report on public lands, the Commission declared that good business sense demanded that a definite land policy be formulated, and believed that the following would serve as a basis therefor:

> 1. Every part of the public lands should be devoted to the use which will best subserve the interests of the whole people.
>
> 2. The classification of all public lands is necessary for their administration in the interests of the people.
>
> 3. The timber, the minerals, and the surface of the public lands should be disposed of separately.
>
> 4. Public lands more valuable for conserving water supply, timber, and natural beauties or wonders than for agriculture should be held for the use of the people from all except mineral entry.
>
> 5. Title to the surface of the remaining nonmineral public lands should be granted only to actual homemakers.
>
> 6. Pending the transfer of title to the remaining public lands they should be administered by the Government and their use should be allowed in a way to prevent or control waste and monopoly.[7]

Volume I of the report (276 pages) contained the report of the National Conservation Commission, along with the comments of President Roosevelt. It also contained the statements of the Secretaries in the four fields and the proceedings of the Joint Conservation Conference. Volume II (771 pages) contained papers on waters and forests, and volume III (793 pages) contained papers on lands, minerals, and national vitality.

[7] Ibid., p. 19.

NATIONAL WATERWAYS COMMISSION

CIRCUMSTANCES

The River and Harbor Act of March 3, 1909 (25 Stat. 815), created the National Waterways Commission. The Commission was assigned the duty of investigating questions pertaining to water transportation and the improvement of waterways, and of making recommendations to Congress.

ORGANIZATION

The National Waterways Commission was composed of 12 Congressmen, as follows:

SENATE

Theodore E. Burton, Ohio, Chairman
Jacob H. Gallinger, New Hampshire, Vice Chairman
Samuel H. Piles, Washington
Wm. Alden Smith, Michigan
F. M. Simmons, North Carolina
James P. Clarke, Arkansas
William Lorimer, Illinois

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

D. S. Alexander, New York
Frederick C. Stevens, Minnesota
Irving P. Wanger, Pennsylvania
Stephen M. Sparkman, Florida
John A. Moon, Tennessee
Woodbury Pulsifer and Joseph H. McGann, secretaries

Others participating in framing the report were:

Rear Adm. C. S. Sperry, Navy
Col. W. H. Bixby, Corps of Engineers
Maj. F. A. Mahan, Corps of Engineers
Prof. Frank H. Dixon, Dartmouth College
E. O. Merchant, Columbia University

The Commission held numerous meetings, both in the United States and Europe. Seven of the twelve members took a 2 months' tour of Europe for an examination of European waterways. A majority of the members also examined the Mississippi River from St. Paul to New Orleans, some inspected the Missouri River from Kansas City to its mouth, and the Illinois River from its lower portion up to the head of navigation.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The preliminary report was submitted in January 1910, and the final report in 1912. The two reports were published as Senate Document 469, 62d Congress, 2d session (579 pages).

The members of the Commission presented unanimous conclusions and recommendations on the following subjects:

1. The advisability of the Federal Government constructing the proposed canal connecting Lake Erie with the Ohio River near Pittsburg, the expense of which is to be borne by the local interests affected, (which the Commission believed the Federal Government to be justified in cooperating with the localities which were to furnish the funds to the extent of building the approaches to the canal and of lending them the Army engineers to perform the engineering work necessary for its construction); the feasibility of constructing an artificial waterway from Lake Erie to Lake Michigan by the Maumee River or other suitable route (on which the Commission recommended a 14-foot barge canal, but also recommended that first a survey be made by the Corps of Engineers to determine what is the most feasible route, the probable cost of construction, and its traffic possibilities); and the feasibility of constructing a canal from the Anacostia River at some point near the District of Columbia boundary line to Chesapeake Bay (which the Commission recommended not be adopted).

2. Further legislation for protecting waterways against railway competition and for establising more amicable relations between the two agencies of transportation. (The Commission recommended increasing the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission over water carriers and also increasing its power over joint rates and through routes between rail and water lines, so that it might form such routes and compel such joint rates wherever it was for the public interest. The Commission also recommended that the Interstate Commerce Commission be given power to compel physical connection between railways and waterways wherever possible and necessary for the formation of through routes, and the Interstate Commerce Commission should have power to compel railways to charge less than the local rates to all lake, river, and sea ports on through traffic to be exchanged with boat lines engaged in domestic trade, unless prorating arrangements already existed.)

3. Desirable legislation for the control of public terminals. (The Commission found that private interests, especially the railroads, controlled most of the water terminals, requiring payment of unreasonable charges for

their use. They recommended that Federal channel improvements not be made unless sufficient assurance was given that proper wharves, terminals, and other necessary adjuncts to navigation be furnished by municipal or private enterprise and that the charges for their use be reasonable. They recommended passing legislation empowering State or municipal officials to condemn such property for public use. However, the Commission did not recommend that the Federal Government be given this power unless it was found that the States and localities could not adequately solve the problem.)

4. The practicability of impounding reservoirs for flood prevention and aiding navigation. (The Commission felt that the use of storage reservoirs as a means of controlling floods, although expensive, became more practicable where the value of the property liable to damage was great and where the reservoirs could be used simultaneously for other beneficial purposes, such as power development and aiding navigation. The Commission believed that flood prevention was mostly a local problem, and the work of controlling subdivisions, but that the Federal Government might very properly participate with the localities in carrying out such works for flood prevention on navigable streams, where a substantial and necessary improvement to navigation would result. They felt that if navigation were not concerned, the Federal Government should have nothing to do with flood prevention.)

5. The influence of forestation upon the navigability of streams and the most salutary policy for the prevention of erosion. (The Commission believed that although forests did influence precipitation, runoff, and erosion, in no case could they be depended upon to prevent either floods or low-water conditions, nor could they be relied upon to secure the uniformity of streamflow needed for navigation or waterpower. The prevention of erosion was found to outweigh all other benefits of forestation and constituted one of the most necessary phases of conservation. The Commission favored the prevention of deforestation of mountain slopes wherever the land was unsuitable for agricultural purposes and urged the reforestation of those tracts which had already been denuded, not only when located at the headwaters of navigable streams but wherever it could be the most valuable use of the land.)

6. Desirable legislation for the development and control of waterpower both in navigable streams and on the public domain. (The Commission stated that in view of the fact that waterpower development lay almost wholly in the future, there was perhaps no more important question before Congress than to shape a broad constructive policy which would amply safeguard the public interest and at the same time promote the development of our waterpower under plans consistent with the maximum beneficial use of the water. It urged the adoption of a comprehensive policy for two reasons: "(1) Because we are entering upon a period of unprecedented waterpower development, which in time will constitute one of the greatest industries of the continent: and (2) because existing laws relating to this subject are in a most crude and unsatisfactory condition, not being adequate either for proper Government control of these enterprises or adapted to encourage waterpower development.") [1]

The Commission declared that "the authority of Congress reaches to the remotest sources in the mountains of every navigable stream." [2] The Commission rejected the view that the Federal Government must limit its activity to matters pertaining solely to navigation, saying that the Government may "constitutionally extend its jurisdiction to questions more remotely connected with the rights of navigation, or even wholly unrelated." [3]

The following reports appeared as appendixes: (1) "Preliminary Report of the National Waterways Commission"; (2) "The Utility of Storage Reservoirs for Flood Prevention, Power, and Navigation," M. O. Leighton; (3) "Effect of the Federal Reservoirs Upon the Flow of Mississippi River for Navigation and Waterpower Development During the Low-Water Period of 1910." Robert Follansbee; (4) "The Practicability of Storage Reservoirs To Prevent Floods and To Benefit Navigation on the Ohio and Other Rivers of the United States," W. H. Fixby; (5) "Forests and Water in the Light of Scientific Investigation," Raphael Zon; (6) "The Law of Waters," G. W. Mooney; (7) "Constitutional Provisions of Various States Relating to Watercourses and the Use of Water," G. W. Mooney; (8) "Federal Statutes Relating to Waterpower," G. W. Mooney; and (9) "A Comparison of American and European Waterways With Special Reference to Factors Influencing the Development of Water Transportation," E. O. Merchant.

[1] S. Doc. 469, 62d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 7–
[2] Ibid., p. 47.
[3] Ibid., p. 44.

WATERWAYS COMMISSION

In the year 1917, Congress enacted two significant pieces of legislation giving recognition to the principle of comprehensive development. The act of March 1, 1917 (39 Stat. 948), provided that all examinations and surveys of projects relating to flood control should include a comprehensive study of the watershed, and required its reports to consider all uses of the water. The act of August 8, 1917 (40 Stat. 250), established the Waterways Commission. In this act, Congress authorized the Commission—

> to bring into coordination and cooperation the engineering, scientific, and constructive services, bureaus, boards, and commissions of the several governmental departments of the United States and commissions created by Congress that relate to study, development, or control of waterways and water resources and subjects related thereto, or to the development and regulation of interstate and foreign commerce, with a view to uniting such services in investigating, with respect to all watersheds in the United States, questions relating to the development, improvement, regulation, and control of navigation as a part of interstate and foreign commerce, including therein the related questions of irrigation, drainage, forestry, arid and swampland reclamation, clarification of streams, regulation of flow, control of floods, utilization of waterpower, prevention of soil erosion and water, storage, and conservation of water for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and domestic uses, cooperation of railways and waterways, and promotion of terminal and transfer facilities, to secure the necessary data, and to formulate and report to Congress, as early as practicable, a comprehensive plan or plans for the development of waterways and water resources of the United States for the purposes of navigation and for every useful purpose, and recommendations for the modification or discontinuance of any project herein or heretofore adopted.

Although the idea of a waterways commission had been introduced in legislation for more than 10 years before it was finally enacted, and was firmly backed by its advocates, the efforts creating the Waterways Commission were in vain. Its members were never appointed, largely because of our entrance into the war. The provision creating it was expressly repealed by the 1920 Federal Water Power Act (41 Stat. 1063), after the House refused to accept a Senate amendment which would have preserved the Waterways Commission but changed its authorized membership to the Secretaries of the Army, Interior, Agriculture, Director of Geological Survey, Forester and Chief of the Forest Service, Director and Chief Engineer of the Corps of Engineers. In rejecting the Senate amendment, the conference committee (H. Rept. 910, 66th Cong., 2d sess.) said:

> In view of the fact that many of the duties imposed upon this Waterways Commission will be assigned to the Water Power Commission under the pending bill and other duties have already been assigned to other governmental agencies under the Transportation Act of 1920, the House conferees opposed this amendment.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

CIRCUMSTANCES

The Joint Committee on Reorganization of the Executive Departments was created under the joint resolution adopted December 17, 1920 (S.J. Res. 191, 66th Cong.), as amended by the joint resolution approved May 5, 1921 (S.J. Res. 282, 67th Cong.).

The resolution creating the Committee described its duties as follows:

> It shall be the duty of the Joint Committee on Reorganization to make a survey of the administrative services of the Government for the purpose of securing all pertinent facts concerning their powers and duties, their distribution among the several executive departments, and their overlapping and duplication of authority; also to determine what redistribution of activities should be made among the several services, with a view to the proper correlation of the same, and what departmental regrouping of services should be made, so that each executive department shall embrace only services having close working relation with each other and ministering directly to the primary purpose of which the same are maintained and operated, to the end that there shall be achieved the largest possible measure of efficiency and economy in the conduct of Government business.

ORGANIZATION

The Committee explained that "in view of the peculiar interest of the President and his Cabinet officers in the question of reorganizing the executive services of the Government, charged as they are with the management and control of those services, Congress saw fit to invite the active participation of the President in the study of the problems intrusted to the Committee; and by the joint resolution of May 5, 1921, it authorized the President to designate a representative to cooperate with the Committee. The President's representative served as Chairman."

The first action of the Committee was to ask President Harding what his conclusions on reorganization were, and on February 13, 1923, the President transmitted to the committee his plan, which served as the basis for the Committee's investigations and discussions. Public hearings were held, all members of the Cabinet except the Secretary of State testified, as well as a considerable number of bureau officers and persons representing private organizations.

Members of the Joint Committee were as follows:

Reed Smoot, Utah
J. W. Wadsworth, Jr., New York
Carl E. Mapes, Michigan
H. W. Temple, Pennsylvania
Walter F. Brown, Chairman (President's designated representative)

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Joint Committee on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government issued its report entitled "Reorganization of the Executive Departments" on June 1924. It was printed as House Document 356, 68th Congress, 1st session (52 pages).

Published as appendix A of the report were the recommendations of President Harding, originally published as Senate Document 302, 67th Congress, 4th session. The outstanding recommendations of the President were as follows:

I. The coordination of the Military and Naval Establishments under a single Cabinet officer, as the Department of National Defense.

II. The transfer of all nonmilitary functions from the War and Navy Departments to civilian departments—chiefly Interior and Commerce.

III. The elimination of all nonfiscal functions from the Treasury Department.

IV. The establishment of one new department—the Department of Education and Welfare.

V. The change of the name of the Post Office Department to Department of Communications.

VI. The attachment to the several departments of all independent establishments except those which perform quasi-judicial functions or act as service agencies for all departments.[1]

The more important changes recommended involving water resource activities were as follows:

WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

(*a*) These departments are placed under a single Cabinet officer, as the Department of Defense. Three Under Secretaries are provided: For the Army, for the Navy, and for National Resources.

[1] H. Doc. 356, 68th Cong., 1st sess., p. 35.

(b) The nonmilitary engineering activities of the War Department, including the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the district and division engineer offices, the Mississippi River and California Debris Commissions, the Board of Road Commissioners for Alaska, and the Office of Public Buildings and Grounds (District of Columbia), are transferred to the Department of the Interior.

(c) The marine activities of the War Department, including the Lake Survey Office, the Inland and Coastwise Waterways Service, and the Supervisor of New York Harbor, are transferred to the Department of Commerce.

(d) The Bureau of Insular Affairs is transferred from the War Department to the Department of State.

(e) The Hydrographic Office and the Naval Observatory are transferred from the Navy Department to the Department of Commerce.

(f) The Revenue Cutter Service, now a part of the Coast Guard in the Treasury Department, is transferred from that Department to the Naval Establishment.[3]

With these recommendations as a background, the Joint Committee proceeded with its study. Its recommendations on transfers and changes in the departments connected with water resources were as follows:

The transfer to the Department of Commerce of certain agencies now situated in other departments whose work is in the field which the Department of Commerce was established to cover. These are the Bureau of Mines and the Patent Office, now in the Department of the Interior; the Lake Survey Office, now under the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army; the Inland and Coastwise Waterways Service, now under the War Department; and the independent National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The committee also recommends the transfer from the Geological Survey and the War Department, respectively, to the Bureau of the Census, of the work of collecting and publishing statistics of mineral production and of waterborne commerce; and the establishment of a new Bureau in the Department of Commerce to be known as the Bureau of Transportation.[3]

Under the heading "Public Works," which included public roads, Alaskan railroads, Alaskan roads and trails, reclamation and waterpower, and public buildings, the Committee said:

These activities all involve important engineering operations—even those which are here classified under the heading "Public Domain." They all require, to a considerable extent, a personnel and an administrative organization of the same general character. And the Committee believes that if they are placed in the control of the same department—a department having these responsibilities exclusively—a general improvement of the service will result, together with a lessening of administrative costs.

The Committee gave careful consideration to a recommendation urged by many that river and harbor work should be withdrawn from the War Department, where it is now handled by the Chief of Engineers, and placed in the Department of the Interior along with the engineering functions above enumerated. It is true, of course, that at the present time the improvement of rivers and harbors and the construction and maintenance of river and port works is chiefly done in the interests of navigation and commerce and presents few if any military aspects; and this constitutes the basis for the view that river and harbor work should be removed from the jurisdiction of the Military Establishment.

With this view, however, the Committee is not in accord. The assignment of Army engineers to river and harbor work is at the present time the principal means whereby these officers can acquire the engineering experience necessary to fit them to meet the demands put upon them in time of war; and, on the other hand, there is a measure of economy in using the personnel of the Corps of Engineers on necessary public works of a nonmilitary character. Although these matters are subject to violent differences of opinion, there is little doubt in the minds of the Committee that the present arrangement tends to increase the value and efficiency of the Corps of Engineers, without material disadvantage, if any at all, to the Government. River and harbor work seems to present special phases of engineering, which would make it difficult to consolidate or amalgamate the organization maintained for its prosecution with other engineering agencies of the Government; and the Committee finds itself unable to recommend any change at this time in the arrangement under which the major responsibility for the engineering maintenance of inland navigable waters and port works is lodged in the War Department.[4]

[3] Ibid., p. 36.
[3] Ibid., p. 12.
[4] Ibid., pp. 20–21.

"308" REPORTS

While they did not, in general, deal with matters of policy, the series of comprehensive river basin planning reports prepared by the Corps of Army Engineers for almost all the river basins of the United States, and generally referred to as "308" reports, are deserving of mention in this compilation as a major step in the development of the Nation's water resources policies.

CIRCUMSTANCES

On March 3, 1925, Congress directed the Army Engineers and the Federal Power Commission jointly to prepare and submit an estimate of the cost of making examinations and surveys of those navigable streams and their tributaries "whereon power development appears feasible and practicable." This was directed to be done with a view to formulating "general plans for the most effective improvement of such streams for the purposes of navigation and the prosecution of such improvements in combination with the most efficient development of the potential water power, the control of floods, and the needs of irrigation" (sec. 3 of the River and Harbor Act of Mar. 3, 1925, 43 Stat. 1186, 1190).

HOUSE DOCUMENT 308 AND SUBSEQUENT REPORTS

The resulting list of streams was submitted to Congress in 1927, and printed in House Document 308 (69th Cong., 1st sess.), from which the name "308 report" evolved. The streams which were considered included all navigable streams upon which power developments appeared to be feasible and tributaries upon which power developments planned to make full development of the resources would be subject to Federal jurisdiction as provided in the Federal Water Power Act, except for the Colorado River, which was expressly excluded in the 1925 act.

In the 1927 River and Harbor Act, Congress authorized the prosecution of these surveys by the Army Engineers (act of Jan. 21, 1927, 44 Stat. 1010). In 1935, it directed that these surveys be supplemented by such additional study or investigations as "necessary to take into account important changes in economic factors as they occur, and additional streamflow records, or other factual data" (act of Aug. 30, 1935, 49 Stat. 1028, 1048).

Over the ensuing years, over 200 reports have been prepared, many of which have become the basis for the Nation's present broad program of river basin development.

EXECUTIVE ORDERS GROUPING, COORDINATING, AND CONSOLIDATING CERTAIN EXECUTIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

CIRCUMSTANCES

On June 30, 1932, the Congress enacted provisions which would provide for the reorganization of the executive departments, authorizing the President to issue Executive orders transferring executive agencies to and from departments and independent executive agencies and to designate titles and duties of the officials connected therewith. The act (47 Stat. 382) provided that such Executive orders be transmitted to the Congress while it was in session and that they not become effective until the expiration of 60 calendar days, unless the Congress should approve them.

Section 401 of the act stated:

> In order to further reduce expenditures and increase efficiency in government it is declared to be the policy of Congress—
>
> (a) To group, coordinate, and consolidate executive and administrative agencies of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;
>
> (b) To reduce the number of such agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head;
>
> (c) To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort; and
>
> (d) To segregate regulatory agencies and functions from those of an administrative and executive character.

ORGANIZATION

The Executive orders were prepared by President Hoover and discussions of them were prepared by the Bureau of the Budget.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

On December 9, 1932, President Hoover presented his recommendations in the form of Executive orders to the Congress (H. Doc. 493, 72d Cong., 2d sess., 76 pages). On the subject of public works, the President declared:

> I have established a Division of Public Works in the Department of the Interior and designated that the title of one of the present Assistant Secretaries shall be changed to "Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Works," under whose direction I have grouped the following organizations and functions:
>
> 1. The Bureau of Reclamation, now in the Department of the Interior.
>
> 2. The Geological Survey, now in the Department of the Interior.
>
> 3. The Office of the Supervising Architect, which is transferred from the Treasury Department to the Department of the Interior.
>
> 4. The nonmilitary activities (except the "Survey of northern and northwestern lakes" and the "Supervisor of New York Harbor") administered under the direction or supervision of the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, including rivers and harbors and flood control work, and the duties, powers, and functions of the Mississippi River Commission, the California Debris Commission, the Joint Board of Engineers for the St. Lawrence River Waterway, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and the Intercoastal Canal Board, which are transferred from the War Department to the Department of the Interior, and the said commissions and boards shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Secretary of the Interior.[1]

Other recommendations in the field of public works included construction or administration of roads, bridges, parks, etc., to be transferred to the Division of Public Works in the Department of the Interior.

In his explanation of this change, the President said, in part:

> The river and harbor and flood control work now performed by the Office of the Chief of Engineers and the various commissions and boards reporting or responsible to the Chief of Engineers is primarily nonmilitary in character. It is related to national defense in only the most indirect manner and then largely because it pertains to the general transportation capacity and economic strength of th country in time of war. It was originally placed under the control of the War Department because at the time river and harbor improvements were first undertaken by the U.S. Government, the War Department was the only Government establishment which possessed a group of engineers of sufficient size and training to prosecute the work satisfactorily.
>
> The prosecution of river and harbor improvements and flood control work under the Corps of Engineers has necessarily resulted in the expansion of the officer personnel of that Corps beyond the point to which it would normally have grown if its field of operations had been confined to strictly military activities. It is proposed that the services of engineer officers should continue to be available by detail in the performance of this work.

[1] H. Doc. 493, 72d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 2, 3.

This river and harbor improvement and flood control work is similar to and should be grouped with other public works and construction activities. It is recommended, therefore, that these activities now performed under the direction and supervison of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, be transferred to the Department of the Interior where they will be closely coordinated with other Federal public works functions.[2]

Hearings were held by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on the proposed changes of President Hoover, and they issued a report (H. Rept. 1833, 72d Cong., 2d sess.) which recommended nullifying the Executive orders of the President. The committee explained that while it was apparent that certain activities of the Government were not most advantageously placed and that related activities should be brought together, they felt that these changes would come on the eve of the inauguration of a new President, which was not a very appropriate moment.

The committee also said:

There is no present economy in what is proposed by the President. What is proposed is merely a rearrangement of present activities. The orders do not even purport to require discontinuance or even curtailment of existing activities so as to reduce present costs. True, they suggest that subordinates may work out and, with the approval of the President, adopt changes that it is hoped will permit economies—but when? And what assurance has Congress that subordinates will ever so function? They seldom do. It was the clear purpose of the economy law that claimed avenues to economy in operation should be made to appear, that they might be considered in determining whether proposed action should be approved or denied.

One thing is certain—the changes provided for in the Executive orders will cause present loss and expense—and this just at a time when rigid economy is essential—yes, imperative. It is to be observed that there are a large number of changes proposed—a shifting of present activities from one place to another, and so forth. To be even reasonably effective or to permit of any benefit there will likely be necessary an extensive and costly moving program with attendant loss of time, rearrangement of space not only to accommodate moved agencies but to accommodate existing agencies thereto, with possibly need for further expense to rent additional or more convenient space. This would likely involve a present expenditure of no small amount, and the attendant loss of time by officers and employees—with retard of official business—would be difficult to measure but would prove very real.[3]

The committee recommended passage of House Resolution 334, 72d Congress, 2d session, which disapproved the Executive orders of President Hoover. This resolution was agreed to January 19, 1933, and the Executive orders were repealed by the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1428).

[2] Ibid., p. 11.

[3] H. Rept. 1833, 72d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 4–5.

REPORTS OF THE IMPORTANT COMMITTEES AND BOARDS PREPARING EMERGENCY PROGRAMS IN THE FIELD OF NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES DURING THE ECONOMIC DEPRESSION OF THE 1930's

A. President's Committee on Water Flow

CIRCUMSTANCES

On February 2, 1934, the Senate and the House passed Senate Resolution 164 and House Resolution 248 (73d Cong., 2d sess.), requesting the President to report on—

> a comprehensive plan for the improvement and development of the rivers of the United States, with a view of giving the Congress information for the guidance of legislation which will provide for the maximum amount of flood control, navigation, irrigation, and development of hydroelectric power.

ORGANIZATION

Pursuant to this resolution, President Franklin D. Roosevelt requested the Secretaries of the Department of the Interior, War, Agriculture, and Labor—Secretaries Harold L. Ickes, George H. Dern, H. A. Wallace, and Frances Perkins, respectively—to advise him on the development of a water policy and on the choice of projects.

Six technical subcommittees were appointed to study the various watersheds and to indicate the basins most favorable for early consideration and action. Each subcommittee was assigned a region.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

On June 4, 1934, the report of the President's Committee on Water Flow was published (423 pages). It was entitled "Development of the Rivers of the United States," issued as House Document 395, 73d Congress, 2d session.

The Committee selected the 10 most promising projects or drainage basins for further development of comprehensive plans, and in order of priority they were (1) Tennessee Valley, (2) St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Basin, (3) Mississippi—main stem, (4) Missouri including the Platte, (5) Sacramento-San Joaquin, (6) Delaware River Basin, (7) Columbia River Basin, (8) Colorado River Basin, (9) Ohio Valley, and (10) Great Salt Lake Basin. The reasons for selection of these watersheds were given in considerable detail in the body of the report.

The Committee stated:

> The reports of the technical subcommittees and the recommendations of the Cabinet committee are directional in character. Further surveys and adequate planning would be required if they are adopted as the program of development. The work once planned could proceed progressively and the initial units undertaken would not commit the Government to the completion of the whole program until financial and other considerations permit.

The Committee also found much of the basic data to be fragmentary and scattered among many bureaus and agencies, and recommended that the organization which prepared this study be allowed to continue to function in order to develop more specific plans for the projects selected.

B. Mississippi Valley Committee of the Public Works Administration

CIRCUMSTANCES

The report of the Mississippi Valley Committee was in answer to the instructions of the Public Works Administration to make a plan for the use and control of water within the Mississippi drainage basin, an area comprising all or parts of 31 States.

ORGANIZATION

Members of the Mississippi Valley Committee were as follows:

Harlan H. Barrows, chairman of the Department of Geography, University of Chicago
Herbert S. Crocker, consulting engineer, Denver, Colo.
Glen E. Edgerton, lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers
Henry S. Graves, dean, School of Forestry, Yale University
Edward M. Markham, major general, Chief of Engineers
Charles H. Paul, consulting engineer, Dayton, Ohio
Harlow S. Person, consulting economist, New York City
Sherman M. Woodward, professor of hydraulics, State University of Iowa
Morris L. Cooke, consulting engineer, Philadelphia, Chairman

The Committee held a large number of hearings, especially in connection with projects proposed for Federal aid, and heard testimony from Members of Congress and from other interested

groups. They also received assistance from Federal agencies and universities and colleges.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

On October 1, 1934, the report of the Mississippi Valley Committee was issued (234 pages). It was presented in a very colorful and dramatic manner, bringing new recognition of the broad problems of social and economic policy inherent in water resources planning.

In its discussion of the problem of control, the Committee warned of the difficulties in determining the most ideal uses of a river, and stated that scientific planning requires a use pattern for each community, district, or region, as well as a geographical pattern which will reflect as fairly as possible the dominant needs of each locality. In the question of control of floods, the Committee said:

> Floods pay no attention to political jurisdictions. Any coordinated system of control will demand the cooperation of neighboring States with each other as well as the cooperation of State with the Federal Government. Obviously the Federal Government should bear its share of the costs and the responsibility. Obviously, too, the States should do the same. To make this easily possible we need uniform State flood control laws, Federal legislation to expedite interstate compacts, and a permanent policy of Federal participation based on accurate estimates of the benefits to be derived. The integrity of State and local governments is certain to be impaired if the Federal Government is regarded as a kind of Santa Claus.
>
> It is suggested that the Federal Government might pay 30 percent of the cost of labor and materials for projects of chief benefit only to local communities, a larger proportion as the measurable general benefits increased, and 100 percent of the construction costs when the benefits to be derived were, as they are now recognized to be on the lower Mississippi and its backwater areas, a national affair. In each instance there should be responsible and legally constituted local agencies with which the Government could deal.[1]

As to the question of navigation, the Commission recommended:

> We need new estimating, accounting, and cost-finding techniques not only to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of river transportation but to determine the proper place of inland waterways in a coordinated national transportation system. It may be desirable to introduce a new element by imposing charges where they are justified by special services and special facilities and where the traffic can bear them.[2]

The Committee recommended coordination of installed power, and Government regulation of transmission "regardless of the number of generating plants or transmission lines it may ultimately own." It recommended the building of power installations in the Mississippi Valley and of greatly increasing the rural electrification projects.

The Committee made specific recommendation on the different river basins in the Mississippi Valley and then called for consideration of the interrelated interests of the entire Mississippi River system.

C. National Resources Board

CIRCUMSTANCES

On June 30, 1934, the President, by Executive Order No. 6777, established the National Resources Board as successor to the National Planning Board and the Committee on National Land Problems, thus effecting a consolidation of previously existing agencies and a continuation of earlier activities. The Board was instructed to prepare a report on water resources in time for consideration at the next session of Congress. The Mississippi Valley Committee became the Water Planning Committee of the new Board.

ORGANIZATION

The National Resources Board was composed of the following:

Harold L. Ickes, Chairman
Frederic A. Delano, Vice Chairman
Daniel C. Roper, Secretary of Commerce
George H. Dern, Secretary of War
Charles E. Merriam, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago
Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture
Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor
Harry L. Hopkins, Federal Emergency Relief Administration
Wesley C. Mitchell, Director, National Bureau of Economic research

The Water Planning Committee of the Board was as follows:

Morris L. Cooke, Chairman
H. H. Barrows
H. S. Crocker
Lt. Col. G. E. Edgerton
H. S. Graves
Charles H. Paul
H. S. Persons
S. M. Woodward
Thorndike Saville, executive engineer
Perry R. Taylor, Secretary

The Board acknowledged the previous reports of the Mississippi Valley Committee of the Public Works Administration and the President's Committee on Water Flow as giving new importance and broader interpretation to water planning.

[1] Report of the Mississippi Valley Committee, p. 8.
[2] Ibid., p. 4.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The report of the National Resources Board entitled "A Report on National Planning and Public Works in Relation to Natural Resources and Including Land Use and Water Resources" was submitted to the President on December 1, 1934 (455 pages). The report attempted to make an inventory of "our national assets and of the problems related thereto."

The Board recommended establishment of a permanent water planning section of the National Resources Board. The functions of the Water Planning Section would be (*a*) to assemble basic data existing in scattered places; (*b*) to proceed rapidly with constructive programs for water resources development; (*c*) to make full use of existing public agencies; and (*d*) to investigate water pollution in all its phases.

The Board recommended 17 drainage basins for detailed engineering, social, financial, and legal study of water resources projects. It recommended that studies for water projects and programs for adoption by Congress be prepared on the basis of drainage basins as a whole and consider a great variety of water and land uses and controls.

It recommended further study concerning division of responsibility and costs among Federal, State, and local authorities.

The Land Planning Committee made recommendations concerning reclamation policies, stating that a well-rounded plan for use of water in the arid regions be developed with State participation in the planning and development of reclamation projects. They felt that the general national policy should be to complete and perfect old developments and to utilize them fully before undertaking new ones. They also recommended giving consideration to facilitating the development of numerous small and seemingly unimportant irrigation operations which, though essentially local in significance, in the aggregate are of considerable economic importance.

D. National Resources Committee

CIRCUMSTANCES

The National Resources Committee, by Executive Order 7065, was organized in June 1935, reconstituting the National Resources Board. The Water Resources Committee of the National Resources Committee was instructed to undertake a national drainage-basin study and to report the results for transmittal to the President on December 1, 1936. The investigation had three major objectives: (1) to determine the principal water problems in the various drainage areas; (2) to outline in broad terms an integrated pattern of water development and control designed to solve those problems; and (3) to present specific construction projects and investigation projects as elements of the integrated pattern or plan, with general priorities of importance and time, some of the projects to be Federal, others State, and still others local in character.

President Roosevelt indicated that previous efforts in the public works field had been undertaken somewhat hurriedly in the emergency, and that "now it is time to develop a long-range plan and policy for construction—to provide the best use of our resources and to prepare in advance against any other emergency."

ORGANIZATION

To accomplish the task, the Water Resources Committee set up a special organization involving as key members a director and 14 regional water consultants. The regional water consultants embodied their own findings and recommendations in 127 reports submitted to the Water Resources Committee. The Committee published its findings in its report.

This report supplemented and extended the work of the President's Committee on Water Flow (1934), the Mississippi Valley Committee of the Public Works Administration (1933–34), and the Water Planning Committee of the National Resources Board (1934–35).

The members of the National Resources Committee were as follows:

Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, Chairman
Harry H. Woodring, Secretary of War
Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture
Daniel C. Roper, Secretary of Commerce
Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor
Harry L. Hopkins, Works Progress Administrator
Frederic A. Delano
Charles E. Merriam
Henry S. Dennison
Beardsley Ruml

The members of the Water Resources Committee of the National Resources Committee preparing the 1936 report were as follows:

Abel Wolman, chief engineer, Maryland State Department of Health, Chairman
Harlan H. Barrows, professor of geography, University of Chicago
H. H. Bennett, chief, Soil Conservation Service
Ira N. Gabrielson, chief, Bureau of Biological Survey

N. C. Grover, chief hydraulic engineer, U.S. Geological Survey
Edward Hyatt, State engineer of California
Maj. Gen. Edward M. Markham, chief of engineering, New York University
John C. Page, acting commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation
Thorndike Saville, dean, College of Engineering, New York University
R. E. Tarbett, senior sanitary engineer, U.S. Public Health Service
Thomas R. Tate, chief, Division of Power Resources and Requirements, Federal Power Commission
Sherman M. Woodward, chief water control planning engineer, Tennessee Valley Authority

The members of the Water Resources Committee preparing the 1937 revision were as follows:

Abel Wolman, Chairman
Bushrod W. Allin, Office of Land Use Coordination, Department of Agriculture
H. H. Barrows, professor of geography, University of Chicago
Milton S. Eisenhower, Coordinator of Land Use Planning, Department of Agriculture
N. C. Grover, Chief Hydraulic Engineer, U.S. Geological Survey
Edward Hyatt, State engineer of California
Roger B. McWhorter, Chief Engineer, Federal Power Commission
John C. Page, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation
Thorndike Saville, dean, College of Engineering, New York University
Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Corps of Engineers
R. E. Tarbett, senior sanitary engineer, U.S. Public Health Service
Sherman M. Woodward, chief water control planning engineer, Tennessee Valley Authority

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The major effort of the Committee was the report entitled "Drainage Basin Problems and Programs," which discussed the principal water problems in each area and recommended lists of projects for investigation or construction in order of priority. The report submitted in December 1936 (540 pages) was revised and brought up to date in 1937 (154 pages).

The recommendations and summaries of the 1936 drainage basin report were included in the report of the National Resources Committee on Public Works Planning (H. Doc. 140, 75th Cong., 1st sess., 221 pages), issued February 3, 1937.

The National Resources Committee, in the foreword to the 1937 revised report, stated that a sound Federal policy must have the following characteristics:

1. It will be concerned, not with water by and for itself, but with the promotion of public safety, public health, the public convenience and comfort, the economic welfare of the public, the establishment or maintenance of a high standard of living.

2. It will seek to promote the maximum integrated control and use of water, within the changing limits of technical feasibility and of economic and social justifications.

3. It normally will treat drainage areas as units.

4. It will observe the rights of States both in intrastate and interstate streams.

5. It will hold facts to be indispensable prerequisites to sound action.

6. It will assign the cost of constructing and operating projects among the agencies concerned in general accordance with the distribution of benefits.

7. In determining whether or not projects are justifiable, and in distributing the costs of projects among the beneficiaries, it will take account of social benefits as well as economic benefits, general benefits as well as special benefits, potential benefits as well as existing benefits, where they are involved.[3]

In its recommendations on flood control, the Committee outlined a program of investigations and construction which would continue many projects already authorized or underway. They urged further study of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, and an inauguration of comprehensive studies on the problems of flood control and prevention in general.

They stated:

The Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, represented an important effort definitely to establish a Federal policy with respect to flood control throughout the United States. It established the admirable principle of local participation in the cost of flood control projects authorized by the Congress. In its application, however, there will be a lack of harmony in many instances between the distribution of costs and the distribution of benefits. It fails to make the control of floods an effective part of a plan for multiple-purpose control of water. It authorizes certain projects which relate to floods only in minor degree, in contravention of policies on the major interests involved.[4]

As to irrigation, the Committee said:

Irrigation in the West has reached the end of a definite stage in its history. No more large developments of simple type and low-unit cost are possible. Hereafter all large projects will be complex, of multiple-purpose type, and necessarily will involve relatively high costs per acre for the land irrigated. The inequities of the present arrangement for liquidation of Federal projects are already matters of definite concern and the subject of a current investigation authorized by the Congress. As an aid in reshaping Federal reclamation policy with a view to providing opportunities for people to make homes and gain suitable livings under the conditions of the new stage upon which irrigation is entering, a survey should be made

[3] National Resources Committee. "Water Planning" (1938, p. 7.
[4] Ibid., p. 9.

of the water resources and water requirements of practically the entire West.

Since water is the limiting factor in the development of the West, control of its use is the key to progress. The Federal Government (as also the States) will be justified in requiring, so far as possible, that water be used in the ways and in the places that will yield the largest economic and social values, provided, of course, that the costs of optimum integrated development are assessed with equitable regard to the accruing benefits. The problems of preventing excessive use of water in irrigation and of transferring water supplies from poor lands to good lands are widespread, difficult, and will yield only gradually to the cooperative efforts of Federal, State, and local agencies. Public policy should look forward, however, to accomplishment of these ends.[8]

The Committee's recommendation on water-power policy was as follows:

If power can be developed economically as a phase of the regulation of a river, it should be developed. To waste it would be reprehensible. To sell it would not only help to serve the energy-consuming public but would also help to defray the cost of controlling the river. A multiple-purpose project that would otherwise be impracticable may be made entirely feasible through power development. The costs of a project should be allocated with proper regard to the relative values of the several benefits involved, and the revenues from the sale of power should be based on the share assigned to power.

The foregoing concepts led to recommendations elsewhere in this report that the latent power resources of American rivers be developed as rapidly as feasible; that multiple-purpose projects be considered as joint developments for the several purposes involved; that costs be distributed among the purposes in fair relation to the value of the benefits of all types; and that programs for the coordination of existing and future power facilities be based on investigations of the production, transmission, and marketing of power. Such investigations obviously should precede the formulation of any program for the installation of power facilities at multiple-purpose projects.[9]

The Committee found that many inland waterways were not used sufficiently to justify the expenditures made to improve and maintain their navigability. They recommended that navigation projects be selected in proper order and recommended integrated programs of river development by a planning agency free from administrative responsibilities connected with the construction or operation of projects.

The Committee found pollution abatement to be a local responsibility, but recommended Federal encouragement of pollution abatement through loans or grants to public agencies, and loans to nonpublic agencies.

Some of the other publications of the National Resources Committee dealing with water resource development were as follows:

1. Inventory of the Water Resources of the United States, June 1935. This is a report covering basic data, present development, and potential development of the water resources of the United States. The report is divided into eight sections according to drainage areas, and the parts published separately.
2. Report on Water Pollution by the Special Advisory Committee of the Water Resources Committee, appointed in December 1934 to study the conditions of a comprehensive plan of attack on the problem of pollution. Published in September 1935. 82 pages.
3. Second Report on Water Pollution, by the Special Advisory Committee. Published as a part of the record of hearings on H.R. 2711, H.R. 2300, and H.R. 3419. Published in May 1937. 54 pages.
4. Deficiencies in Basic Hydrologic Data, published in September 1936. A report of the Water Resources Committee which proposes remedies for current deficiencies in hydrologic data essential for sound water conservation. Includes recommendations for standardization of procedures and measures. 66 pages.
5. Regional Factors in National Planning and Development, published in December 1935, dealing with important problems of planning and development which overlap State lines or which involve Federal and State or local interests and jurisdictions.
6. Regional Planning, Parts I–VII. Each part was published separately, analyzing the problems of the Pacific Northwest, St. Louis Region, New England, Baltimore-Washington-Annapolis area, Red River of the North, Upper Rio Grande, and Alaska.
7. Public Works Planning, published December 1, 1936, and transmitted to Congress by President Roosevelt on February 3, 1937. This was a report recommending a proposed policy for planning, programing, timing, and division of costs of public works, including a report on drainage basin problems and programs. This report was prepared by the Projects Division of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, a special research staff on division of costs of public works, and the Water Resources Committee of the National Resources Committee.
8. Criteria and Planning for Public Works, a research report by Russell V. Black, research consultant, June 1934. This report was prepared at the request of the former National Planning Board as one of a series of researches on different aspects of public works. It was a report upon a research in national physical planning, the magnitude of future public works and criteria applicable to their

[8] Ibid., p. 9.
[9] Ibid., pp. 9–10.

selection and programing, with tentative conclusions. 182 pages.

9. Economics of Planning Public Works, by John Maurice Clark, professor of economics, Columbia University. This report presents a part of the research work carried on by a staff serving under the National Planning Board to answer the question: How may public works be so handled as to contribute as much as they can to industrial stability? 1935. 194 pages.
10. Public Works in Prosperity and Depression, and their utilization as an agency of economic stabilization, by Arthur D. Gayer, September 1935. This volume is a revised version of the official report made to the National Planning Board by Dr. Gayer in June 1934. 484 pages.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE EXECUTIVE AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

CIRCUMSTANCES

The Select Committee To Investigate the Executive Agencies of the Government was created under Senate Resolution 217 (74th Cong.), passed February 24, 1936. The Committee was to—

make a full and complete study of the departments, bureau, boards, commissions, independent agencies, and all other agencies of the executive branch of the Government, with a view to determining whether the activities of any such agency conflict with or overlap the activities of any other such agency and whether, in the interest of simplification, efficiency, and economy, any of such agencies should be coordinated with other agencies or abolished or the personnel thereof reduced.

The Committee was directed to report to the 75th Congress, and from time to time thereafter the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

ORGANIZATION

Members of the Select Committee on Investigation of the Executive Agencies of the Government were as follows:

Harry Flood Byrd, Virginia, *Chairman*
Joseph T. Robinson, Arkansas
Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Wyoming
Charles L. McNary, Oregon
John G. Townsend, Jr., Delaware

The Committee asked the Brookings Institution to make a functional and factfinding survey of the agencies of the Government.

Members of the regular staff of the Brookings Institution who worked on the project were as follows:

Frederick F. Blachly
Charles L. Dearing
Charles O. Hardy
Adah Lee
Lewis Meriam
Malcolm Merriam
A. C. Millspaugh
Laurence F. Schmeckebier
Daniel T. Selko

The special staff was composed of the following:

Horace A. Bacus
Spurgeon Bell
Mrs. M. DeRichey Cain
Esther Cole
Nils V. B. Hansell
Avery Leiserson
G. W. Lineweaver
C. D. Masters
E. G. Montgomery
Robert H. Overstreet
Charles E. Persons
John B. Rae
Charles Thomson
Mrs. J. Kerwin Williams

Fred W. Powell, Director

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

On June 19, 1937, Harold G. Moulton, president of Brookings Institution, submitted the report entitled "Organization of the Executive Branch of the National Government" issued as Senate Report No. 1275 (1,229 pages). The report dealt with such problems as administrative organization; expansion of governmental activity; financial administration of the Federal Government; governmental activities in the fields of private finance; public supply and property; public works and water resources; mineral resources and power; transportation; public personnel; library, informational, and statistical services; public domain; agriculture, and wildlife and aquatic resources; promotion of commerce and industry; regulation of private business enterprises; law enforcement; and public welfare.

Chapter 6 dealt with the Government activities in the field of public works and water resources. The conclusions, in brief, were that (1) the wide diversity of the functions makes it impossible to unite all the governmental activities in the field of public works and water resources in a single department simply because their administration utilizes personnel, techniques, and equipment that are vaguely grouped under the heading engineering and are therefore assumed to be characterized by interchangeability; and (2) the creation of a central public works organization to undertake all construction for the Federal Government does not appear to offer any advantages either in economy or efficiency. Two reasons why these conclusions had been reached were (1) that engineering and construction work in the National Government is generally a process incidental to the exercise of a broader, more general function; and (2) the work is so diverse in character that it requires different types of specialists.

However, the Brookings Institution survey did find that, in the case of river improvement projects in which navigation is of secondary impor-

tance, construction and operation might be entrusted to a separate engineering organization, located in the same department as the Bureau of Reclamation. "It appears desirable that the Corps of Engineers of the War Department should be relieved of its nonmilitary responsibilities." [1]

It was also recommended that the Bureau of Reclamation should be located either in the Interior Department, or in a Department of Land Use, and the lending of its facilities to other agencies with similar engineering problems should be encouraged.

Chapter 8 dealt with Government activities in the field of transportation. It was concluded that, of the entire range of Federal activities designed to promote and regulate transportation services, two basic adjustments must be made if Federal promotional activity is to be brought into conformity with the operating facts of the modern transportation system and if it is to be conducted in such a way that it would not run counter to adopted regulatory policy. First, an articulated national policy relative to Federal promotional activity must be substituted for the present collection of divergent policies. Second, administrative machinery adapted to the application of this policy should be created and certain adjustments should be made in the distribution of regulatory functions. Two general proposals were made for the establishment of such machinery and adjustments:

1. Consolidation in a single agency, either a newly created Department of Transportation or a Division of Transportation in the Department of Commerce, of all promotional work of the Federal Government (including direct operation of transportation business) which is carried on primarily in the interest of transportation development.

2. Reallocation of regulatory functions, calling in most cases for the concentration of regulatory activity in the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Adoption of this proposal involves both essential and optional transfers of units and functions. If it is to be properly effectuated the following units or functions should be transferred from various departments or commissions either to a newly created Department of Transportation or to a Division of Transportation in the Department of Commerce:

1. Bureau of Public Roads, from the Department of Agriculture.

2. Functions now performed by Corps of Engineers in the promotion of navigation facilities, from the War Department.

3. Promotional functions now exercised by the Bureau of Air Commerce of the Department of Commerce together with research functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

4. Lighthouse Service, from the Department of Commerce.

5. Inland Waterways Corporation, from the War Department.

6. Promotional, operational, and investigatory functions of the Maritime Commission.

7. Division of Transportation, from the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce.

In the matter of optional adjustments, consideration should also be given to the validity of transferring to the Department of Transportation, or a Division of Transportation, certain portions of the work performed by the following agencies:

1 That portion of the Coast and Geodetic Survey activities which involves coastal mapping—from the Department of Commerce.

2. Activities of the Hydrographic Office and the Naval Observatory which relate primarily to commercial water transportation—from the Navy Department.[2]

[1] S. Rept. 1275, 75th Cong., 1st sess., p. 307. ["Organization of the Executive Branch of the National Government."]

[2] Ibid., pp. 451–452.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT

CIRCUMSTANCES

In transmitting the report of the Committee on Administrative Management on January 12, 1937, President Roosevelt gave the following important reason for creating this Committee:

> Now that we are out of the trough of the depression, the time has come to set our house in order. The administrative management of the Government needs overhauling. We are confronted not alone by new activities, some of them temporary in character, but also by the growth of the work of the Government matching the growth of the Nation over more than a generation.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> Over a year ago it seemed to me that this problem of administrative management of the executive branch of the Government should be a major order of business of this session of the Congress. Accordingly, after extended discussions and negotiations, I appointed a Committee on Administrative Management, to examine the whole problem broadly and to suggest for my guidance and your consideration a comprehensive and balanced program for dealing with the overhead organization and management of the executive branch as it is established under the Constitution.[1]

ORGANIZATION

The President's Committee on Administrative Management was composed of the following men:

Louis Brownlow, Chairman
Charles E. Merriam
Luther Gulick
Joseph P. Harris, Director of Research

The Committee received the advice and counsel of many Government officials, citizens, and officers and employees of the National Emergency Council.

The report was written by the Committee members.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The report of the President's Committee, entitled "Administrative Management in the Government of the United States," was submitted to the President on January 8, 1937. It was printed as Senate Document No. 8, 75th Congress, 1st session (84 pages).

The Committee commented that economy, the elimination of duplication and contradictory policy, a simple and symmetrical organization, higher salaries and better jobs, and better business methods and fiscal control were all important but not the only objectives. It said: "There is but one grand purpose, namely, to make democracy work today in our National Government; that is, to make our Government an up-to-date efficient, and effective instrument for carrying out the will of the Nation."[2]

The main proposals of the Committee were as follows:

1. Expand the White House staff so that the President may have a sufficient group of able assistants in his own office to keep him in closer and easier touch with the widespread affairs of administration and to make a speedier clearance of the knowledge needed for Executive decision;
2. Strengthen and develop the mangerial agencies of the Government, particularly those dealing with the budget, efficiency research, personnel, and planning, as management arms of the Chief Executive;
3. Extend the merit system upward, outward, and downward to cover all non-policy-determining posts; reorganize the civil service system as a part of management under a single responsible administrator, strengthening the Civil Service Commission as a citizen civil service board to serve as the watchdog of the merit system; and increase the salaries of key posts throughout the service so that the Government may attract and hold in a career service men and women of the highest ability and character;
4. Overhaul the 100 independent agencies, administrations, authorities, boards, and commissions and place them by Executive order within one or the other of the following 12 major executive departments: State, Treasury, War, Justice, Post Office, Navy, Conservation, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Social Welfare, and Public Works; and place upon the Executive continuing responsibility for the maintenance of effective organization;
5. Establish accountability of the Executive to the Congress by providing a genuine independent postaudit of all fiscal transactions by an Auditor General, and restore to the Executive complete responsibility for accounts and current financial transactions.[3]

The Committee recommended that a National Resources Board, consisting of five members appointed by the President, without salary and with indefinite terms, be created to serve as a central planning agency under the President. The personnel of the Board "should bring together insight, experience, and judgment in the analysis

[1] S. Doc. 8, 75th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 1–2.

[2] Ibid., pp. 17–18.

[3] Ibid., pp. 82–83.

and interpretation of national planning policies, skill in the invention of ways and means of utilizing our national resources, and social vision in the fusion of American modes of conserving and expanding our national resources and facilitating their equitable award." [4]

In its recommendation for the establishment of a Department of Public Works, the Committee designated the Department's responsibilities as (1) to advise the President with regard to public works, and (2) to design, construct, and maintain large-scale public works which are not incidental to the normal work of other departments, except as their agent on request; to administer Federal grants, if any, to State and local governments or other agencies for construction purposes; and to gather information with regard to public works standards throughout the Nation.

[4] Ibid., p. 58.

THE COMMISSION ON REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

(First Hoover Commission)

CIRCUMSTANCES

On July 7, 1947, the act creating the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government was signed into law. The Commission was assigned the duty of examination and recommendation under the following statement from the act (Public Law 162, 61 Stat. 246):

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improve service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by—
>
> 1. Limiting expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential service, activities, and functions;
> 2. Eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;
> 3. Consolidating services, activities, and functions of similar nature;
> 4. Abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government; and
> 5. Defining and limiting executive functions, services, and activities.

ORGANIZATION

The Commission was bipartisan, with six members from each party. Four Commissioners each were chosen by the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and President Truman. Members of the Commission were as follows:

Herbert Hoover, Chairman
Dean Acheson, Vice Chairman

Arthur S. Flemming	John L. McClellan
James Forrestal	James K. Pollock
George H. Mead	Clarence J. Brown
George D. Aiken	Carter Manasco
Joseph P. Kennedy	James H. Rowe, Jr.

The Hoover Commission began its report by defining some 24 of the principal problems of government and management, including such fields as personnel, budgeting and accounting, the Post Office, the National Security Organization, the State Department, and many others. The Commission created 24 task forces with authority to engage such research aid as they might require. The Task Force on Natural Resources submitted its own report on "Organization and Policy in the Field of Natural Resources." The members of this task force were as follows:

Leslie A. Miller, former Governor of Wyoming, Chairman
Horace Albright, former Director, National Park Service
John Dempsey, former Governor of New Mexico
Ralph Carr, former Governor of Colorado
Donald H. McLaughlin, president, Homestake Mining Corp.
Dr. Isaiah Bowman, president, Johns Hopkins University
Dr. Gilbert White, president, Haverford College
Prof. Samuel T. Dana, dean, School of Forestry and Conservation, University of Michigan
A special unit of the Legislative Reference Service under the direction of Ernest S. Griffith, Director

The Task Force on Natural Resources conducted its study through (1) a series of meetings which provided direct exchange of views and discussion of the problems by the committee members; (2) consultation with authorities on various aspects of natural resource problems; (3) examination of background material and analyses prepared by its staff; and (4) modest field investigations. The task force also conducted a mail survey of the views of certain trade associations, public interest groups, and State agencies concerned with natural resources. The preparation of the material for the task force's discussions and for the final report was conducted by a special unit of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

SUMMARY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS (FULL COMMISSION REPORT)

On March 17, 1949, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government submitted its report on the Department of the Interior (94 pages), issued as House Document 122, 81st Congress, 1st session. The Commission proposed that the Department of the Interior be given more clearly the mission of development of subsoil and water resources. As

these activities require large public works, the Commission recommended that other major public works also be managed by this Department.

Some of the recommendations touching directly or indirectly on water resources development were as follows:

We recommend the creation of a Board of Impartial Analysis for Engineering and Architectural Projects which shall review and report to the President and the Congress on the public and economic value of project proposals by the Department. The Board should also periodically review authorized projects and advise as to progress or discontinuance. The Board should comprise five members of outstanding abilities in this field and should be appointed by the President and included in the President's office.[1]

We recommend that the agencies listed below should be transferred to other offices or Departments, to which they are functionally more related:

a. The Bureau of Indian Affairs to a new department for social security, education, and Indian affairs.

b. The Bureau of Land Management (except minerals) to the Department of Agriculture.

c. The Commercial Fisheries from the Fish and Wildlife Service to the Department of Commerce.[2]

We recommend that the following agencies related to the major purposes of the Department of the Interior be transferred to it:

a. Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors improvement from the Department of the Army.

b. Public Building Construction from the Federal Works Agency.

c. Community Services from the Federal Works Agency.

d. Certain major construction to be assigned on behalf of other agencies of the Government, except where carried on by grants-in-aid programs.[3]

We recommend as logical and practical the following major purpose assignments of the reorganized department functions:

WATER DEVELOPMENT AND USE SERVICES

Reclamation
Rivers and Harbors Improvement
Flood Control
Bonneville Power Administration
Southwestern Power Administration
Division of Power

A study should be made as to separation of certain general survey activities from the Federal Power Commission and their inclusion in this department.[4]

(Other services dealt with in this recommendation were building construction, mineral resources, recreation, and territories and possessions).

We recommend that the rivers and harbors and flood control activities of the Corps of Engineers be transferred to the Department of the Interior and that any Army engineers who can be spared from military duties be detailed to the Department in positions similar to those which they now hold in the Corps of Engineers.[5]

The Commission recommends that a drainage area advisory commission be created for each major drainage area, comprising representatives of proposed Water Development and Use Service of the Department of the Interior, the proposed Agricultural Resources Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture, and that each State concerned should be asked to appoint a representative. The purpose of these drainage boards should be coordinating and advisory, not administrative.[6]

The Commission * * * recommends that the responsibility for negotiating international agreements continue with the State Department, but that all construction be made a function of the Water Development and Use Service.[7]

We recommend that no irrigation or reclamation project be undertaken without a report to the Board of Impartial Analysis by the Department of Agriculture.[8]

There was not unanimous agreement on these recommendations; Commissioner James Forrestal dissented from several of the above, and John L. McClellan and Carter Manasco dissented from the recommendation to transfer the flood control, river and harbors projects from the Corps of Engineers. In a separate report, Vice Chairman Dean Acheson and Commissioners Pollock and Rowe recommended a Department of Natural Resources, saying:

Our own view is that the conservation, development, and use of our public resources is a single indivisible problem. It can be solved wisely only by the leadership of one governmental agency which would relate each part of that problem—forests, water, public lands, minerals, wildlife, fisheries, recreation, power—to the others and develop all of our natural resources together.[9]

TASK FORCE REPORT ON NATURAL RESOURCES

In January 1949, the task force issued its report entitled "Organization and Policy in the Field of Natural Resources" (244 pages). The full Commission did not accept all of the recommendations of the task force, although some were in accord with each other. The task force recommended a more adequate program of gathering basic data, revision of statutory policies, concentration of functions in a single water development agency, this agency (to be called Water Development Service) to be decentralized along river basin lines, and more adequate measures taken for coordination and review.

[1] H. Doc., 122, 81st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 2–4.
[2] Ibid., pp. 7, 8.
[3] Ibid., pp. 8–10.
[4] Ibid., p. 15.
[5] Ibid., p. 35.
[6] Ibid., p. 38.
[7] Ibid., p. 38.
[8] Ibid., p. 39.
[9] Ibid., p. 54.

TASK FORCE REPORT ON WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

In January 1949, Arthur B. Roberts, consulting engineer, prepared the "Task Force Report on Water Resources Projects" (65 pages). Among the recommendations were (1) a return to the policy of requiring local contributions; (2) shift of emphasis from development of channelized water to water conservation in connection with land use and soil conservation; (3) control of nonnavigation uses of water at Government reservoirs by the States; (4) Federal power policy providing for the utilization of private companies in marketing power from Federal dams; (5) rates charged by the Federal Government for power not to be higher than power received from an alternate source; and (6) the Federal Government should not build, or acquire in the future, any thermal powerplants for the generation of electrical energy that is to be sold. Mr. Roberts also recommended that the Federal Power Commission or the proposed Water Resources Board review water resources projects.

TASK FORCE REPORT ON PUBLIC WORKS

In January 1949, Robert Moses, chairman of the New York State Department of Parks and of the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, prepared the "Task Force Report on Public Works" (81 pages). He recommended a complete integration in a new major Department of Works of Cabinet rank of all scattered engineering and related functions, including operational as well as service and research functions. Under this plan, there would be a reorganization and consolidation of what is left of the Interior Department with Public Works, after various functions now discharged by Interior were redistributed to Agriculture and elsewhere. In place of the Interior Department this would result in a new Department of Works headed by a Cabinet officer.

He also emphasized the need for advance plans for depressions, and described the waste involved by hastily formed plans. The report also attempted to show how the recommendations of the Natural Resources Task Force as to organization could be reconciled with its recommendations.

Hearings were held in June 1952 before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (82d Cong., 2d sess.) on legislation pertaining to recommendations made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. H.R. 6243 was introduced to transfer the civil functions of Army Corps of Engineers to the Department of the Interior. However, this bill was not passed by the Congress.

PRESIDENT'S WATER RESOURCES POLICY COMMISSION

(Cooke Commission)

CIRCUMSTANCES

On January 3, 1950, the President issued Executive Order 10095, establishing the Water Resources Policy Commission. Mr. Truman outlined the duties of the Commission as follows:

> The President's Water Resources Policy Commission shall study, and make recommendations to the President with respect to, Federal responsibility for and participation in the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources, including related land uses and other public purposes to the extent that they are directly concerned with water resources. The Commission shall give consideration in particular to (*a*) the extent and character of Federal Government participation in major water resources programs, (*b*) an appraisal of the priority of water resources programs from the standpoint of economic and social need, (*c*) criteria and standards for evaluating the feasibility of water resources projects, and (*d*) desirable legislation or changes in existing legislation relating to the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources.

ORGANIZATION

The President designated the Chairman and six other members, and ordered all executive departments and agencies to cooperate with the Commission. The following men were chosen to compose the Commission:

Morris L. Cooke, Chairman

Paul S. Burgess	Leland Olds
Lewis Webster Jones	Roland R. Renne
Samuel B. Morris	Gilbert F. White

The professional staff was as follows:

Edward A. Ackerman, professor of geography, University of Chicago
John C. Beebe, engineer, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho
Wesley Calef, assistant professor of geography, University of Chicago
John M. Carmody, Washington, D.C.
Cyril E. Childe, transportation consultant, Washington, D.C.
Alfred G. Etter, research assistant in ecology, Washington University
Horace M. Gray, professor of commerce and business administration, University of Illinois
Leon M. Jourolmon, Jr., Knoxville, Tenn.
Margaret M. Kingman, cartographic consultant, Washington, D.C.
Walter C. Lowdermilk, hydrologist and soil conservationist, Berkeley, Calif.
Charles McKinley, professor, Division of History and Social Science, Reed College, Portland, Oreg.
Harvey S. Perloff, associate professor, Division of Social Science, University of Chicago
Jane Greverus Perry, economist, Washington, D.C.
Isabel Picken, research analyst, Missouri Division of Resources and Development
Jewell J. Rasmussen, associate professor of economics, University of Utah
John A. Short, engineer, Missouri Division of Resources and Development
David Weeks, professor of agricultural economics, University of California

The Commission established relations with a great variety of sources, including universities, Federal agencies, individuals in the various scientific and technical, and social and economic fields covered in the report, and private and public power associations and trade associations. Public conferences were held in 8 cities, with more than 2,000 people attending and 500 individuals expressing themselves on various phases of water resources development.

The Commission prepared a set of 18 major questions on various phases of water resources policy, receiving more than 600 returns. A group of 15 leading economists and sociologists were asked to consult with the Commission concerning the analysis of the questionnaires and the overall program of water resources.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

A three-volume report was submitted by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, volume I in December 1950 and the other two volumes in February 1951.

Volume I, entitled "A Water Policy for the American People" (445 pages), set forth the main report of the Commission, including the recommendations and discussions of the various phases of water resources development. Subjects covered were regional development; national objectives in water resources planning; unity in planning; evaluation; reimbursement; a resources investment program; the need for basic informa-

tion; surface and ground water; watershed management; flood management; land reclamation; domestic and industrial water supply; pollution control; inland and intracoastal waterways; hydroelectric power; recreation; fish and wildlife; conservation education; and legal aspects of water resources development.

The Commission recommended that the Nation should guard against any wasteful use of water resources, and that new proposals for water resources development be submitted to Congress only in the form of basin programs. The Commission recommended:

> To insure the preparation of sound basin programs, Congress should direct the responsible Federal agencies to cooperate with each other and with the appropriate State agencies in the necessary surveys and plans. Such action requires some definite coordination of the efforts of Federal and State agencies. While administrative reorganization in the field of natural resources is outside the assignment of this Commission, the Commission believes that lacking such agency reorganization as was recommended by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (Hoover Commission), Congress should set up a separate river basin commission for each of the major basins. These commissions, set upon a representative basis, should be authorized to coordinate the surveys, construction activities, and operations of the Federal agencies in the several basins, under the guidance of independent chairmen appointed by the President and with the participation of States agencies in the planning process.[1]

The Commission recommended that procedure for evaluation be revised to apply to multiple-purpose basin programs, and to projects only as constituent parts of such programs, and that Congress apply the same standards and methods to the evaluation of all river basin programs. The Commission called for a Federal board of review to review projects to insure an orderly formulatoin of national water resources programs.

The Commission recommended submission of an investment appraisal statement to the Congress which would include a complete estimate of the costs to the American people, both direct and indirect, of undertaking any project. Direct costs should include the initial investment in preliminary investigation, survey, and plan; construction; land acquisition; rights-of-way; utility replacement; and administration and overhead. Indirect costs comprise those resulting from displacement of population, loss of land and minerals, loss of wildlife, and loss of scenic or historic values. The indirect costs may be stated in non-monetary terms. The investment appraisal statement should also include a complete estimate of primary and secondary benefits: primary benefits evaluated in terms of monetary value and secondary benefits estimated according to a uniform procedure developed with the approval of the Board of Review, reflecting increase in national income resulting from the program.

The Commission also called for Congress to provide for compilation and analysis of the necessary basic data. In its financing program, the Commission recommended that "the entire procedure should result in 6-year river basin capital investment programs and annual budgets, originating in the agencies, coordinated by the river basin commissions, and reviewed by the Board of Review for submission to the Bureau of the Budget." Reimbursement for various types of benefits from water resources programs should be determined according to the following principles:

> (*a*) for domestic and industrial water supply and hydroelectric power it should provide for full repayment of water supply or power costs including operation and maintenance, repayments with interest of an appropriate allocation of the program investment, and payment in lieu of local and State taxes which would have been paid on acquired properties; (*b*) for drainage, irrigation, and watershed management it should be based on ability to pay, without interest, measured by the resulting increase in the land operator's net earnings; (*c*) for navigation it should be determined in connection with a general program for putting charges for all forms of transportation on a cost basis, including interest; (*d*) for all other benefits, the responsibility for securing repayment of the cost of primary and secondary benefits should be shared by the States on an agreed basis, which general welfare benefits should be the responsibility of the Federal Government.[2]

Other recommendations dealt with water resources management, land reclamation, water supply, pollution control, waterway transportation, hydroelectric power, fish, wildlife, and recreation, and future possibilities in the field of water resources. Some of the recommendations in these fields included keeping the 160-acre limitation, consideration of possible future water requirements of large water-using industries in connection with comprehensive basin programs, setting up a vigorous program of abating pollution, and undertaking research programs for future supplies.

Volume II of the Commission's report was entitled "Ten Rivers in America's Future" (793 pages). Ten river basins were analyzed in terms

[1] Report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, p. 10.

[2] Ibid., pp. 12–13.

of their problems and potentialities, and included the Alabama-Coosa, Central Valley of California, Colorado, Columbia, Connecticut, Missouri, Ohio, Potomac, Rio Grande, and Tennessee River Basins.

Volume III (777 pages), entitled "Water-Resources Law," included an examination of certain constitutional considerations, statutes relating to navigation, flood control, irrigation, power, other public purposes, and related land uses.

The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings on May 18, 21, and 22, 1951 (82d Cong., 1st sess.) on "An Interpretation of the Recommendations of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission."

THE PRESIDENT'S MATERIALS POLICY COMMISSION

(Paley Commission)

CIRCUMSTANCES

On January 22, 1951, the President created the Materials Policy Commission to make a long-range study of the Nation's materials problem. In his letter to Mr. William S. Paley, Chairman, on January 22, 1951, Mr. Truman declared that the Commission was to study the broader and longer range aspects of the Nation's materials problem as distinct from the immediate defense needs.

The President continued:

> This is one of the crucial problems facing the Nation. By wise planning and determined action we can meet our essential needs for military security, civilian welfare, and the continued economic growth of the United States. We cannot allow shortages of materials to jeopardize our national security nor to become a bottleneck to our economic expansion. The task of the Commission, therefore, will be to make an objective inquiry into all major aspects of the problem of assuring an adequate supply of production materials for our long-range needs and to make recommendations which will assist me in formulating a comprehensive policy on such materials.

He asked the Commission to study such questions as (1) the long-range requirement outlook; (2) the long-range supply outlook; (3) the prospect and estimated extent of shortages; (4) the consistency and adequacy of existing Government policies, plans, and programs; and (5) the consistency and adequacy of private industry practices.

ORGANIZATION

President Truman appointed the following members of the Materials Policy Commission:

William S. Paley, Chairman

George R. Brown	Eric Hodgins
Arthur H. Bunker	Edward S. Mason

The executive staff was as follows:

Philip H. Coombs, Director
Max Isenbergh, General Counsel
William C. Ackerman, Executive Secretary
Norvell W. Page, Editor

Eleven groups were appointed to the staff in the following capacities or fields: domestic resources, foreign resources, energy resources, technology, security and market policy, commodity studies, staff consultants, editorial, legal, statistics, and administrative. The economic analysis groups undertook the projection of estimates of economic needs and materials supply into the future, and the study of the past and present role of materials in national economies. The legal staff made a detailed scrutiny of laws bearing on materials problems, and a statistical services staff amassed tables and estimates on growth of populations, production, trade and investment rates, tariffs and other duties, tax rates, and price movements. A commodity panel undertook a series of studies on a score or more of specific materials.

Because of the tremendous number of research projects necessary to the study, many were placed in the hands of Government and international agencies, in industry, and in universities to provide the background of fact and analysis for the Commission's deliberations.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

On June 2, 1952, the President's Materials Policy Commission submitted its report to the President. It contained five volumes, titled as follows:

Volume I. Foundations for Growth and Security (184 pages.)
Volume II. The Outlook for Key Commodities (210 pages.)
Volume III. The Outlook for Energy Sources (43 pages.)
Volume IV. The Promise of Technology (228 pages.)
Volume V. Selected Reports to the Commission (154 pages.)

In the field of water resources, the Commission included a chapter entitled "Supplying Industry with Water" (ch. 10, vol. 1). In this chapter, the Commission cited four general ways of overcoming scarcities of suitable industrial water. They were (1) total usable supply in an area may be increased, mainly by leveling out supplies throughout the year; (2) quality of water may be improved through treating water just before use, or by removing or reducing sources of contamination; (3) industrial users of water may cut consumption or modify requirements; and (4) in many areas available water can be better apportioned among different types of users.

The Commission believed that the following basic principles should be followed in shaping national policies and executing national programs for the use of water resources: (1) Planning and developing water resources must comprehend all aspects of the collection, conservation, and use; (2) the varied and complex problems of water can be attacked best by integrated action in each major drainage basin, under a general national policy for use of water resources; (3) highest economic use must be made of scarce supplies; (4) benefits must exceed costs; and (5) known beneficiaries should help pay for improvements.

The Commission felt that the Federal Government could contribute to improving and increasing water supplies through research, tighter planning of programs, and cooperation in efforts to control and reduce pollution. The Commission stressed the importance of abatement of pollution, saying:

> This Commission believes that alternative measures must be taken if at the end of a sufficient testing period—say 5 years—progress in pollution abatement has been clearly inadequate. One possible device is a Federal tax on industrial operations that result in pollution of navigable waters and interstate streams. Such a tax could be designed to fortify local enforcement efforts and still leave development and execution of abatement programs in the hands of local authorities. It would give industry a dollar-and-cents incentive to undertake antipollution measures. Serious thought should be given now to this and other possibilities for future action. In the interest of industry, and indeed of the whole Nation, surface water must become cleaner and not more contaminated.[1]

The Commission also felt that Congress should consider the desirability of extending construction loans and grants under the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, as amended, to include private industries as well as municipalities.

Volume III, which dealt with energy sources, declared that the requirements of a successful program of electricity expansion were threefold:

> First, every opportunity must be taken to harness undeveloped waterpower potential at a rapid pace wherever economically feasible. Since much of this development will have to be at Federal multipurpose sites, Government surveys, planning, and authorization and appropriation procedures should be markedly hastened.
>
> Second, full advantage should be taken of opportunities that exist to improve technical efficiencies and otherwise effect economies to hold down or reduce costs of electricity production, particularly in thermal generation plants.
>
> Third, existing capacity and future installations should be geared into broadly designed, integrated operations covering wide regions. This approach holds great promise for the most efficient use of sources of electric power.[2]

In volume IV, dealing with "the promise of technology," ocean resources and solar energy are mentioned as possible sources of fresh water of energy in the future. The Commission felt that neither of these resources had been adequately explored, calling for more research in the fields.

---

[1] Report of the President's Materials Policy Commission, p. 56 (vol. I).

[2] Ibid., p. 31 (vol. III).

SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY CIVIL WORKS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 82D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

(Jones Subcommittee)

CIRCUMSTANCES

On August 20, 1951, the House Committee on Public Works adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Public Works is hereby authorized to appoint a special subcommittee to study the policies, practices, and procedures in connection with the authorization and construction of river-and-harbor and flood-control projects and report back to the committee with the utmost dispatch its findings and recommendations thereon.

In accordance with this authority, the subcommittee, was appointed and began work on October 1, 1951. Hon. Robert E. Jones, Jr., chairman of the subcommittee, declared [1] that the responsibilities of the subcommittee were to include a study of (*a*) flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors, (*b*) public works for the benefit of navigation, (*c*) water power, and (*d*) oil and other pollution of navigable waters. He said that the subcommittee recognized that numerous works constructed primarily for those purposes would provide benefits to irrigation and reclamation, national parks and recreation, forest resources, and conservation, and that these functions were primarily the responsibility of committees other than the Committee on Public Works. However, the subcommittee decided to study policies, procedures, and practices which have a direct impact on the above-mentioned functions even though they were outside its jurisdiction. "In the proper study of Federal projects and programs involving benefits in the areas under its jurisdiction, the subcommittee was of the opinion that it would doubtless need to consider works undertaken in the interests of functions which are the responsibilities of other committees," Mr. Jones explained.

ORGANIZATION

The chairman of the Committee on Public Works, Charles A. Buckley, named the following subcommittee:

Robert E. Jones, Jr., Chairman

Henry D. Larcade, Jr.	George A. Dondero
Clifford Davis	Homer D. Angell
Frank E. Smith	Russell V. Mack
Thaddeus M. Machrowicz	Howard H. Baker

Charles D. Curran, Staff Director

The subcommittee inspected work in the field and conferred both in Washington and in the field with representatives of various departments and agencies of the executive branch, representatives of State and local governments, members of nongovernmental organizations, and with private citizens. Between March 27 and May 16, 1952, it held 20 public hearings at which Federal Government witnesses were heard from the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Federal Power Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

The Subcommittee To Study Civil Works presented its report to the Committee on Public Works on December 5, 1952, in a series of four committee prints, as follows:

House Committee Print No. 21—The Civil Functions Program of the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army (39 pages).

House Committee Print No. 22—The Flood Control Program of the Department of Agriculture (43 pages).

House Committee Print No. 23—The Allocation of Costs of Federal Water Resource Development Projects (31 pages).

House Committee Print No. 24—Economic Evaluation of Federal Water Resource Development Projects (55 pages).

The subcommittee felt that the problems in the field of water resources could not be solved by simple reorganization or by the establishment of a board of review. It believed that conflicts among the agencies should be eliminated and greater coordination affected. They stated:

Your subcommittee is convinced that, for the maximum economic return from Federal water resource development, a single integrated plan must be developed and provided for each stream. It is of the opinion that the pro-

[1] U.S. Congress. House. Subcommittee To Study Public Works of the Committee on Public Works. Hearings. "Study of Civil Works." Pt. 1. Mar. 27, 28, 31, and Apr. 2, 3, 29, 1952, pp. 1–2. (82d Cong., 2d sess.)

cessing of unintegrated segments through different committees and the ultimate enactment of conflicting projects can lead only to waste and a chaotic situation. It believes that no segment of a plan should be approved by any committee or enacted by Congress so long as major conflicts exist between such segment and the parts properly under jurisdiction of some other element of the executive branch. The insistence of Congress upon coordination through its refusal to authorize conflicting elements would probably bring about the necessary coordination more quickly than any amount of reorganization. The agencies of the executive branch must be shown that they cannot attain their conflicting ends by playing one committee of Congress against the other.[2]

The subcommittee declared that if Congress would establish clearly four elements of policy, much of the apparent need for reorganization and for establishment of a review board would cease to exist. These four elements are (1) phases in water-resource development for which the Federal Government should assume some responsibility and some measure of the degree of that responsibility, (2) the place of local and State interests in the Federal development of water resources, (3) uniform standards for use by the executive branch for the measurement of the economic justification of water resource development projects, and (4) uniform standards for the allocation of costs in multiple-purpose projects and uniform criteria for the establishment of rates for the sale of products to recover such costs.

[2] House Committee Print No. 21, 82d Cong., 2d sess., "The Civil Functions Program of the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army," p. 38.

In its report on the civil functions program of the Corps of Engineers, (Committee Print No. 21) the committee noted that there was a large backlog of surveys which had not been completed but which had been on the books for a number of years, and that on the other hand additional surveys were needed in current problem areas. It recommended changing existing procedures so that the program could be kept current. Six-year programs should be prepared and kept current to reflect new authorizations, the annual budget and annual appropriations. The subcommittee listed its recommendations to improve the economic evaluation, presentation, and coordination of the program of the Corps of Engineers.

In its report on the flood control program of the Department of Agriculture (Committee Print No. 22) the subcommittee concluded that waterflow retardation and soil erosion prevention are not flood control in the accepted sense of keeping large flows of water from causing excessive damage. "It is misleading to the general public for any agency to imply otherwise." Therefore the subcommittee recommended that legislation be enacted to cancel present directives and authority for the Department of Agriculture to make flood control surveys presently authorized under flood control law or resolutions of the Committee on Public Works.

After the Subcommittee To Study Civil Works made these recommendations, the Corps of Engineers regrouped its projects into (1) active, (2) inactive, and (3) deferred for restudy.

MISSOURI BASIN SURVEY COMMISSION

While not of national scope, the studies by the Missouri Basin Survey Commission were of such breadth and scope that they deserve mention in this review of studies of national water resources.

CIRCUMSTANCES

On January 3, 1952, the President issued Executive Order 10318 (subsequently modified on February 9, 1952). The order, as amended, directed the Commission to study the land and water resources of the Missouri River Basin and such other related matters as the Commission may deem appropriate, and to prepare recommendations with respect to an integrated and comprehensive program of development, use, and protection of said resources.

In a statement released at the time he established the Commission, President Truman said that the 1951 floods had emphasized the need for an up-to-date survey. He said that although there were many valuable aspects to previous plans, there was need for a thorough reevaluation of the whole problem. He asked the Commission to "give the country their advice as to the best way to proceed to achieve any orderly, business-like development of the resources of the basin."

The Commission was empowered to conduct on-the-site surveys and appraisals of land and water resource programs, and hold public hearings to obtain information and expressions of public sentiment of the inhabitants of the basin. All related departments and agencies of the Government were directed to cooperate with the Commission.

ORGANIZATION

The Commission was composed of 11 members appointed by the President, with the Chairman and Vice Chairman designated by the President. The Executive Director of the Commission was to be appointed by the Chairman of the Commission after consultation with the other members.

The members of the Missouri Basin Survey were as follows:

James E. Lawrence, Chairman

Hon. Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., Vice Chairman	Hon. Clifford R. Hope
Hon. James E. Murray	Hon. James W. Trimble
Hon. Milton R. Young	Fred V. Heinkel
Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall	Kenneth Holum
	H. T. Person

Harry J. Peterson

Paul J. Cannell, Executive Director

The Commission held 17 public hearings in the basin and heard more than 400 witnesses. Approximately 3,000 persons attended the hearings. There was at least one hearing in each of the 10 basin States, and the Commission reported that everyone who wished to be heard had the opportunity to present his statement.

Members of the Commission and staff inspected projects and visited areas and sites proposed for development. Federal and State agencies submitted reports of their basin activities and offered suggestions.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The report of the Missouri Basin Survey Commission, entitled "Missouri, Land and Water" (295 pages), was published in January 1953. The Commission began its report by noting the lack of balance and coordination in the decisions on resource development of the Missouri Basin. It unanimously determined that the coordination and direction of the development of the basin's resource potential should be entrusted to a new agency created for that purpose. This agency, properly invested with essential powers, would coordinate and direct the program as a single resource project truly dedicated to multiple-purpose goals within the watershed of the Missouri.

The Commission set forth 10 principles to guide in the development of the basin's resources. They were as follows:

(1) The program should be comprehensive—for the basin as a whole and for all its land and water resources.

(2) The people who will be affected by the program should have ample and continuing opportunity to participate in the formulation and to influence the operation of the program.

(3) The combined efforts of the State and Federal Governments should be employed in carrying out the program.

(4) Goals should assure a proper balance among all the various phases of the resource program.

(5) Each project in the program should offer total benefits in excess of all costs.

(6) Costs should be borne in more direct relation to the sharing of benefits.

(7) The program should encourage the diversified development of the basin's resources for both progressive growth and stability.

(8) Each part of the program should be flexible enough to respond to changing needs, yet specific enough to direct program and project plans forward in a consistent course.

(9) The program should be planned and managed to achieve widespread benefits to the residents of the basin.

(10) The program should recognize the basin's limited supply of water and should be based upon a sound preference in the use of this vital asset.[1]

The recommended preference sets up five uses of water in the following order:

1. Domestic and municipal consumption and pollution control.
2. Irrigation, including ground water recharge, and industrial consumption.
3. Hydroelectric power.
4. Fish, wildlife, and recreation.
5. Navigation.[2]

As to the recommendation dealing with organization, the Commission was unanimous in agreeing upon the need for a central organization, but Commissioners Young, Hope, and Person dissented from the Commission view that the proposed Missouri Basin Commission should be a Federal instrumentality. They favored instead an organization created by an interstate compact to which the United States and the Missouri Basin States, or such of them as ratified the compact, would be parties.

Recommendations dealing with national policy called for greater local financial responsibility and a revision in the present formulas for payments in lieu of taxes. Recommendations dealing with State and local participation in the Missouri Basin program called for greater local contributions to resource development; improvements in State resource planning; establishment of State planning agencies; wider State sponsorship of water and land development programs; enactment of better land use ordinances by the States; and appraisal and revision of State water laws. Other recommendations dealt with specific resource problems and economic procedures and practices in the Missouri Basin.

No action has been taken on the Survey Commission's recommendations. Senator Hennings, joined by Senators Symington and Humphrey, introduced S. 3325, 83d Congress, on April 19, 1954, to set up a Missouri Basin Commission and Compact Board along lines envisioned by the majority of the members of the Survey Commission, and this bill has been reintroduced in the succeeding Congresses.

---

[1] Missouri Basin Survey Commission, "Missouri, Land and Water." Pp. 6–7.

[2] Ibid., p. 7.

COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

(Kestnbaum Commission)

CIRCUMSTANCES

On July 10, 1953, an act establishing a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was signed into law (Public Law 109, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 145, 5 U.S.C. 138a). In the declaration of purpose, the act stated:

> Because any existing confusion and wasteful duplication of functions and administration pose a threat to the objectives of programs of the Federal Government shared in by the States, including their political subdivisions, because the activity of the Federal Government has been extended into many fields which, under our constitutional system, may be the primary interest and obligation of the several States and the subdivisions thereof, and because of the resulting complexity to intergovernmental relations, it is necessary to study the proper role of the Federal Government in relation to the States and their political subdivisions, with respect to such fields, to the end that these relations may be clearly defined and the functions concerned may be allocated to the proper jurisdiction. It is further necessary that intergovernmental fiscal relations be so adjusted that each level of government discharges the functions which belong within its jurisdiction in a sound and effective manner.

The Commission was to investigate activities in which Federal aid was being extended to the State and local governments, and to report whether there was justification for such aid. It was also to report on other fields where Federal aid should be extended, and on activities where Federal aid should be limited. The Commission was authorized to hold hearings and to secure information from the executive agencies.

This act was amended twice in order to extend the time limitation set in the original act (Public Law 302, 83d Cong., 68 Stat. 20, 5 U.S.C. 138a, and Public Law 5, 84th Cong., 69 Stat. 7, 5 U.S.C. 138a).

ORGANIZATION

Section 2 of the act stipulated that the Commission was to be composed of 25 members: (1) 15 members appointed by the President of the United States, from among whom the President shall designate the Chairman and the Vice Chairman, provided that not more than 9 are members of the same political party; (2) 5 members appointed by the President of the Senate, 3 from the majority and 2 from the minority party; and (3) 5 members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 3 from the majority and 2 from the minority party.

The members of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations were as follows:

Members appointed by the President:
- Meyer Kestnbaum, Chairman
- Alfred E. Driscoll, Vice Chairman
- William Anderson
- Lawrence A. Appley
- John S. Battle
- John E. Burton
- Marion B. Folsom
- Charles Henderson
- Oveta Culp Hobby
- Sam H. Jones
- Clark Kerr
- Alice K. Leopold
- Val Peterson
- Allan Shivers
- Dan Thornton

Members appointed by the President of the Senate:
- Hubert H. Humphrey
- Alan Bible
- Wayne Morse
- Andrew F. Schoeppel
- John M. Butler

Members appointed by the Speaker of the House:
- John D. Dingell
- Brooks Hays
- James I. Dolliver
- Harold C. Ostertag
- Angier L. Goodwin

Hugh G. Lyle Belsley, Executive Director
George C. S. Benson, Director of Research
Hugh L. Elsbree, Deputy Director of Research

The members of the Study Committee on Natural Resources and Conservation were as follows:

William S. Rosecrans, Chairman
Samuel T. Dana, Vice Chairman

Louis Bromfield	Harry Ruhl
Charles C. Colby	Charles H. Sage
James I. Dolliver	Bert L. Smith
Guy C. Jackson, Jr.	C. I. Weaver
Bernard L. Orell	Edward Woozley

Wayne T. Geissinger, Research Adviser

Individual study on the part of the Committee Members and attendance in meetings brought

forth the major results from the Study Committee. Time did not permit the holding of public hearings, but the Committee obtained a sample of informed opinion by soliciting the views of some 320 State and Federal agencies, chambers of commerce, trade associations, and conservation, wildlife, farm, and other organizations interested in natural resources.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS (COMMISSION REPORT)

In June 1955, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations submitted its "Report to the President for Transmittal to the Congress" (311 pages). The report included discussions of (1) the evolution of the American Federal system; (2) the role of the States; (3) national responsibilities and cooperative relations; (4) financial aspects of the American Federal system; and (5) Federal grants-in-aid. The report included discussions of intergovernmental functional responsibilities in the fields of (1) agriculture, (2) civil aviation, (3) civil defense and urban vulnerability, (4) education, (5) employment security, (6) highways, (7) housing and urban renewal, (8) natural disaster relief, (9) natural resources and conservation, (10) public health, (11) vocational rehabilitation, and (12) welfare.

Chapter 14 of the report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, entitled "Natural Resources and Conservation," outlined briefly the evolution of national responsibilities in natural resources development, National-State cooperation in water management, and the allocation of responsibilities in resources conservation.

The Commission recommendations were as follows:

(1) Establishment by the Congress of a permanent board of coordination and review. Each State to designate or establish a natural resource advisory council to coordinate State policies and administration and to facilitate cooperation with Federal agencies.

(2) Taking account of the views and recommendations of the State and local agencies prior to the authorization of new projects. States to be afforded a larger measure of initiative and responsibility in multipurpose, basinwide development of water resources.

(3) As a matter of broad general policy, agencies of the National Government to observe local laws governing inland waters.

(4) Capital costs of multipurpose, basinwide water resource developments be equitably divided between the National Government and the States concerned, in the light of benefits received, ability to pay, and other attendant circumstances.

(5) Continuation of grants-in-aid for State and private forestry cooperation.

(6) Continuation of cooperative program for restoration and management of fish and wildlife resources.

(7) States should vigorously enforce existing water pollution abatement laws and expand and improve legislation in this field. The National Government should provide technical and financial assistance to State and interstate pollution control agencies. Study should be given to the desirability of Federal financial assistance, for a limited time, to cooperate programs for the construction of pollution abatement facilities. State and National Governments should take steps to insure that their own agencies and installations do not contribute to further stream pollution.[1]

Not all of the members of the Commission concurred fully in all the recommendations, Senators Humphrey and Morse presenting their own comments on many of these recommendations.

STUDY COMMITTEE REPORT ON NATURAL RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION

The Chairman of the Commission, Meyer Kestnbaum, in transmitting the Study Committee report, stated that the Commission's views did not in every case coincide with those of its study committees, although valuable assistance has been obtained from the committees.

Mr. Rosecrans, Chairman of the Study Committee, in his letter submitting the report on "Natural Resources and Conservation," noted that it was significant that the report was approved by a unanimous vote of the Committee, resulting from a careful consideration and judicial action and not from the elimination of controversial subjects.

In many respects, the recommendations of the Study Committee and the full Commission were generally in accord. The Committee recommended that future multipurpose, basinwide development of water resources be on a partnership basis between the Federal Government and the States. In the field of water pollution, however, it advised against a grant-in-aid program.

---

[1] Report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, pp. 241–247.

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

(Second Hoover Commission)

Report on Water Resources and Power

CIRCUMSTANCES

On July 10, 1953, an act establishing the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government was signed into law (Public Law 108, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 142, 5 U.S.C. 138a). In the act it was declared to be the policy of Congress "to promote economy, efficiency, and improve service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government."

The Commission was given the duty of investigating the above-mentioned executive bodies and reporting to the Congress not later than May 31, 1955. The Commission was empowered to hold hearings and to obtain official data from the executive agencies.

ORGANIZATION

Section 3 of the act outlined the membership of the Commission. It was to be composed of 12 members: (1) 4 appointed by the President of the United States, 2 from the executive branch and 2 from private life; (2) 4 appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and (3) 4 appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House and 2 from private life.

The members of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government were as follows:

Herbert Hoover, Chairman

Herbert Brownell, Jr.	Robert G. Storey
James A. Farley	Clarence J. Brown
Arthur S. Flemming	Chet Holifield
Styles Bridges	Joseph P. Kennedy
John L. McClellan	Sidney A. Mitchell

Solomon C. Hollister

The Task Force on Water Resources and Power had the following membership:

Admiral Ben Morrell, Chairman

Charles L. Andrews	Harry W. Morrison
William B. Bates	Lacey V. Murrow
Pope F. Brock	Frank H. Newman, Jr.
Carey H. Brown	Malcolm Pirnie
Charles Ellison	Harry E. Polk
James P. Growdon	Roscoe Pound
Julian Hinds	John W. Reavis
Wesley W. Horner	Donald R. Richberg
John Jirgal	Arthur B. Roberts
Edward A. Kracke	Robert W. Sawyer
J. Bracken Lee	William D. Shannon
Albert C. Mattei	Royce J. Tipton
Leslie A. Miller	

Charles D. Curran, Administrator

The task force made an exhaustive study of the Nation's water problems, investigating over 200 power, navigation, irrigation, and flood control installations. They held public hearings in 5 cities where representatives of various interests in 30 States appeared or filed statements. Among these representatives were 13 Governors and 64 State officials. The public was represented by 52 development and conservation associations, 3 engineering associations, 12 agricultural associations, 14 labor unions, 22 public power utilities, 29 private power utilities, 31 business associations, together with 50 other associations and individuals.

SUMMARY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS (FULL COMMISSION REPORT)

The Commission issued the "Report on Water Resources and Power" June 30, 1955 (219 pages), published as House Document 208, 84th Congress, 1st session.

The Commission prefaced its report by noting the competition for the use of water in certain areas, and local shortages which developed. It also noted the expansion of Federal activities in regulation and construction, and the increasing outlays of money. Then the Commission remarked that we had come to a stage where we

were faced with questions of equitable distribution of water use between the various needs; of equitable taxation for their support; of Federal versus State relations; of problems of participation of States, local communities, and private enterprise in water development; and the need for established national policies which would bring the greatest possible development of these resources for all our people.

The first three recommendations were concerned with policy and organization, and the rest dealt with more specific problems. They were as follows:

1. That the Congress adopt a national water policy on the following nine points:

(*a*) That water resources should be developed to assure their optimum use and their maximum contribution to the national economic growth, strength, and general welfare.

(*b*) That water resources development should be generally undertaken by drainage areas—locally and regionally.

(*c*) That the Federal Government should assume responsibility when participation or initiative is necessary to further or safeguard the national interest or to accomplish broad national objectives, where projects, because of size or complexity or potential multiple purposes of benefits, are beyond the means or the needs of local or private enterprise. Under other circumstances the responsibility for development should be discharged by State or local governments, or by local organizations, or by private enterprise.

(*d*) That in participating in water resources and power development the Federal Government without waiving its constitutional rights should take account of the rights and laws of the separate States concerning appropriation, use, control, and development of waters within their boundaries.

(*e*) That the Federal Government should provide advisory assistance to those local and State agencies that are undertaking water resource and power development projects.

(*f*) That before Congress authorizes or appropriates funds for Federal participation in any water resource project, it should have substantial evidence that the project is economically justified and financially feasible, and that such project is essential to national interest.

(*g*) That one Federal agency should be made responsible for collecting and reviewing the adequacy of hydrologic data.

(*h*) That all Federal agencies administering revenue-producing water resource and power projects should pay all cash revenues to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and receive an annual appropriation for cash operating expenditures.

(*i*) That regulation of rates for sale of electrical energy by all Federal agencies be vested in the Federal Power Commission.[1]

2. That a Water Resources Board be created.[2]

3. That the staff of the Bureau of the Budget be strengthened to fully perform the function of evaluation of the merits of water development projects presented to it for appropriations.[3]

4. That the Congress amend the present acreage limitations so that local conditions could be met and not on a rigid limitation of acreage.[4]

5. That the revolving funds be abolished and all moneys payable into these funds be covered into thte general fund of the Federal Treasury and all project funds be appropriated by the Congress.[5]

6. That the construction of headwater dams in the flood control program of the Soil Conservation Service be transferred to the Corps of Engineers.[6]

7. That all projects declared obsolete or unsound by the Chief of Engineers should be removed from congressional authorizations.[7]

8. That Congress authorize a user charge on inland waterways except for smaller pleasure craft, sufficient to cover maintenance and operation, and authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix such charges.[8]

9. That the Congress empower and direct the Federal Power Commission to fix the rates on Government power sales at such levels as will—

(*a*) Eliminate the inequities now imposed upon the great majority of the people;

(*b*) Amortize and pay interest on the Federal investment in power, plus an amount which will equal Federal tax exemption based upon the Federal taxes paid by the private utilities; and

(*c*) Provide payments in lieu of full taxes to the State and local government equivalent to those the private utilities would pay.[9]

10. That the Government or its agencies cease the building of steam plants and provide for the equation of their power loads by interconnection with the grids of neighboring power systems.[10]

11. (*a*) That the private utilities be permitted to purchase a fair share of Federal power.

(*b*) That no further building of transmission lines be undertaken where such transmission service can be provided by non-Federal agencies.[11]

12. That the Columbia River Basin system, the Hoover-Parker-Davis Dams Administration, the Central Valley project of California, the Missouri River Basin project, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Southeastern Power Administration all be incorporated under and made subject to the Government Corporation Control Act.[12]

13. That they and the Tennessee Valley Authority be required to secure their capital for their future improvements, when authorized by the Congress, by issuing their own securities to the public without subordinating the present Federal investment, thus relieving the taxpayers

[1] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. "Report on Water Resources and Power," pp. 36–37.

[2] Ibid., p. 39.
[3] Ibid., p. 54.
[4] Ibid., p. 55.
[5] Ibid., p. 71.
[6] Ibid., p. 83.
[7] Ibid., p. 85.
[8] Ibid., p. 111.
[9] Ibid., pp. 111–112.
[10] Ibid., p. 113.
[11] Ibid., p. 121.

of this burden. (Recommendation No. 1h amended so as not to apply to the interest and amortization of such public issues and to allow them to pay these items from their own funds.) [11]

14. That representatives from the States concerned, as well as Federal representatives, should be appointed to these boards.[11]

15. In respect to the power component of new multiple-purpose projects, we make the following recommendation:

(a) That private enterprise be offered the opportunity to provide the capital for the electrical component of multiple-purpose dams and dispose of the power through their own systems (they being subject to regulation of rates by Federal and State authorities), but the management of the dams should remain in the Federal Government.

(b) That if such capital be not available, the power should be offered for sale to the private utilities, the States, or the municipalities and cooperatives prior to construction, on terms that will protect the Federal interest.[12]

In three separate statements, published along with the report as volume II, four of the Commissioners dissented either generally or specifically. Commissioners Brownell and Flemming said that while they favored individual parts of the report, they were concerned that the recommendations taken together might impede the Federal Government in developing the Nation's water resources. Commissioner Farley declared that the Commission had overemphasized the role of private enterprise in developing the country's water resources, and the cumulative effect of the recommendations would come dangerously close to inviting an abdication by the Federal Government of its responsibilities in the field. Commissioner Holifield outlined his reasons for dissent in considerable detail, criticizing both the task force itself and its recommendations.

[11] Ibid., p. 121.
[12] Ibid., p. 122.

TASK FORCE REPORT ON WATER RESOURCES AND POWER

Also in June 1955 the Task Force on Water Resources and Power issued its own report, explaining in more detail the recommendations outlined in the Commission's report and presenting separate reports in various fields of water resources. There were 3 volumes, 1,783 pages, in the report.

Volume I included further elaboration on the recommendations of the task force and dissenting statements. Volume II contained the reports of four task groups on power generation and distribution; reclamation and water supply; flood control; and navigation. Volume III contained 17 special studies by specialists in the various fields of water resources.

PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES POLICY

CIRCUMSTANCES

In his letter of May 26, 1954, establishing the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, President Eisenhower called for an extensive review of all aspects of water resources policy. The letter noted that the conservation and use made of our water resources would determine, in large measure, our future progress and standards of living. He said:

> During the more than ½ century in which the Federal Government has played a vital part in the harnessing and development of water resources, our policies have been modified repeatedly to reflect changing needs and priorities. Unfortunately, we have often relied on piecemeal or stopgap measures. In other instances the policies covering different Federal agencies concerned with similar water resources have been inconsistent. Accordingly, it is both fitting and necessary for us to undertake a comprehensive review looking toward modernization of Federal policies and programs in the field of water resources. We must do this with a full realization that the States, communities, and private citizens are vitally concerned with the policies and actions of the Federal Government.

The President directed that the recommendations for "the strengthening, clarification, and modernization of water policies, together with a suggested approach to the solution of organizational problems involved," be submitted to him not later than December 1, 1954.

ORGANIZATION

The President, in his letter, designated Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, as Chairman and Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, and Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, as full members of the committee. Participating on an ad hoc basis were the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Also cooperating was the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization.

The President also informed Secretary McKay that he was approving the establishment of an Inter-Agency Committee on Water Resources, which would provide "a facility for improving the coordination of existing policies, programs, and activities of the participating departments and agencies concerned with water and land resources investigation, planning, construction, operation, and maintenance." The Inter-Agency Committee was to assist the policy committee, also, and replaced a previous voluntary committee known as the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The report of the President's Advisory Committee was issued on December 22, 1955 (35 pages). It was transmitted to the Congress on January 17, 1956, and was printed as House Document 315, 84th Congress, 2d session.

The Committee noted that a sound water policy must look toward an adequate supply of water, prevent waste, reduce water pollution, provide means for the best and most effective distribution of water, improve navigation, and check floods. It recommended:

1. *Basic data.*—That the present program of basic data collection (such as rainfall, streamflows, and hydrology) be accelerated, and be programed and carried out on a more consistent and definite basis.

2. *Planning.*—That planning for water resources and related developments be conducted on a cooperative basis with representatives of all Federal, State, and local agencies involved; and that this joint participation be continuous from the beginning in order that plans and projects developed assure the best and most effective use and control of water to meet both the current and long-range needs of the people of a region, State, or locality, and of the Nation as a whole.

November 4

3. *Organization.*—That an organization plan be adopted substantially as follows:

(*a*) The position of Coordinator of Water Resources be established to provide Presidential direction to agency coordination and to establish principles, standards, and procedures for planning and development of water resources projects.

(*b*) An independent Board of Review be created to analyze the engineering and economic feasibility of projects and report to the President through the Coordinator.

(*c*) Regional or river basin water resources committees be formed with a permanent nonvoting chairman appointed by the President and with membership composed of representatives of all Federal departments and States involved.

(*d*) A permanent Federal Inter-Agency Committee, advisory in character, on Water Resources be established

under the chairmanship of the Coordinator composed of principal policymaking officials of the agencies concerned.

4. *Water rights.*—(*a*) That the principles which recognize water rights as property rights be accepted. That determinations as to disposition of water recognize such rights.

(*b*) That a study be made by the Federal Government in collaboration with State and local entities to determine the relationships between property rights to water and the social and economic development of the Nation and the area, and of the principles and criteria which should be incorporated into Federal, State, and local laws regarding rights to the appropriation and use of water that would assure its best and most effective use and at the same time encourage maximum participation by all parties concerned.

(*c*) That States enact legislation regarding the ownership and right, purpose and place of underground water.

(*d*) That formation of interstate compacts where appropriate be encouraged.

5. *Priority of use of water.*—That no system of relative priorities for use of water should be applied uniformly to the entire country.

6. *Evaluation.*—That evaluations of water projects by all agencies be on a uniform basis, requiring balanced consideration of all benefits and costs which can reasonably be measured in dollars, as well as consideration of other values not readily expressed in monetary terms.

7. *Authorization.*—That each major water resources project be separately authorized by the Congress.

8. *Cost sharing.*—(*a*) That, as a general policy, all interests participate in the cost of water resources development projects in accordance with the measure of their benefits; that the Federal Government assume the cost of that part of projects where benefits are national and widespread and beneficiaries are not readily identifiable; that power and municipal and industrial water users pay the full cost of development; that where projects are primarily local, and the beneficiaries are clearly identifiable, the Federal Government's contribution should be limited, with non-Federal interests bearing a substantial portion of the construction costs of the project as well as the replacement, maintenance, and operation costs; and that under certain conditions the Federal Government may bear a higher proportion of the costs.

(*b*) That the Federal Government encourage non-Federal assumption of responsibility for construction of water resources projects by such means as the payment of costs which would have been nonreimbursable had the projects been federally constructed, and the making or guaranteeing of loans to non-Federal interests for certain purposes under proper safeguards.[1]

The recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee have not been implemented, and the President did not go beyond asking Congress to give them "prompt attention." The Senate, in adopting Senate Resolution 281 (a resolution relating to water projects, policies, and procedures) on July 26, 1956, acknowledged the report. During the hearings on Senate Resolution 281 the Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works heard testimony from various Government officials and interested parties on the recommendations contained in the report.

[1] H. Doc. 315, 84th Cong., 2d sess., pp. XI–XII.

○